

PLINY THE ELDER

PLINY THE ELDER  
AS A  
SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE  
FOR THE HISTORY OF  
THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

By

PAUL RICHARD MOORE, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

(September) 1973

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1973)  
(Roman Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: PLINY The Elder as a Source of Knowledge for The History of  
The Roman Republic

AUTHOR: Paul Richard Moore, B.A. (University of Toronto)

M.A. (University of Toronto)

SUPERVISOR: Professor E.T. Salmon

NUMBER OF PAGES: iii, 212.

SCOPE AND CONTENTS: An introductory chapter sets forth the scope of the thesis. The second, third and fourth chapters set forth and comment on the most significant historical passages in the Historia Naturalis of Pliny the Elder. Chapter five attempts an overall analysis of the historical passages examined in the preceding three chapters. Chapter six draws conclusions on the worth of Pliny as a Roman Historian.

The author would like to thank Professor E.T. Salmon for his kind, patient and useful help throughout the progress of this thesis.

## Chapter I

### The Elder Pliny and Roman History

The Elder Pliny is known to have written historical works on the Early Empire, two of them of considerable length. They are obligingly listed for us by his nephew: De Iaculatione Equestri Unus (Liber), De Vita Pomponi Secundi Duo (Libri), Bellorum Germaniae Viginti (Libri), A Fine Aufidi Bassi Triginta Unus (Libri).<sup>1</sup> None of these have survived, but we know that they were used by other historians, whose work is, in part at least, still extant, Tacitus for instance. Consequently, Pliny has to be taken seriously into account as a source for the history of the opening three quarters of the first century A.D., even if for us only as an indirect one.

So far as is known, however, he did not similarly write any works about the period before AD 14, although no doubt some of his writings on the period after that year, possibly the one on Throwing the Javelin from Horseback, for instance, and certainly the one on the German Wars, must have included sections dealing with Republican subject-matter. Of course, what he did write and what has survived is that huge farrago of fact and fiction, the Historia Naturalis.

In one sense this opus diffusum, eruditum nec minus varium quam ipsa natura,<sup>2</sup> as his nephew calls it, can be regarded as history; but it certainly is not history in the ordinary sense of the word, history of the sort that is taught and studied in schools, colleges and universities and

that publishers and reading-public alike normally look for. History is usually regarded as a record of human activity rather than as an account of what happens in the realm of mother nature, and the Historia Naturalis<sup>3</sup> as its title implies, and as Pliny himself explicitly avers, is concerned with the latter. Moreover, it is probably not far wide of the mark to assume that in the Historia Naturalis Pliny's primary purpose was to entertain, whereas in his more strictly historical writings it was apparently to instruct. Even so, throughout the thirty-seven books of the immense work incidental allusions to history in its generally understood sense abound; and many of them are specifically references to Roman history, from its earliest beginnings down to Pliny's own day. Their introduction into the work, it is true, serves a subsidiary purpose: they are there to illustrate points of natural history and, above all, to give a Roman flavour to the "natural" material, much of which is taken from Greek sources. But there is a large number of them, and their presence in the Historia Naturalis means that, even though Pliny wrote no book dealing exclusively with the history of the Roman Republic, he did, nevertheless, record, in reference form, a great deal about the period before A.D. 14 in the last and greatest and the only surviving one of his several works.

Probably no two persons are likely to agree about the number of such allusions the Historia Naturalis contains, since it is not always a simple or straightforward matter to decide what constitutes a historical reference.<sup>4</sup> When Pliny mentions, as he often does, a practice or a custom, can he invariably be regarded as referring to an historical happening in the common and perhaps unduly narrow meaning of the expression? Is he purveying anything more than an item of mere antiquarian curiosity? Yet practices and customs

are the basic material out of which social history is made; so that if Pliny, to give but one example, quotes Varro as saying<sup>5</sup> that the (Atilii) Serrani were so conservative that they would not allow women members of their clan to wear linen, he is perhaps not merely regaling us with a titbit of antiquarianism: he might be telling us, even unwittingly perhaps, something about what early Rome was like, or at any rate what Varro thought it was like.

The present study, however, is concerned with the factual, precise and detailed aspect of Roman history, rather than with the general and sociological; and for that reason it examines those passages in the Historia Naturalis that supply information on specific events or persons in Roman history before the death of Augustus. Those of a more generalized kind which cannot be pinpointed in space or time or that cannot be exploited to shed light on what really happened (to use Ranke's famous expression), appear in these pages only incidentally, if at all. Of course, to decide which of the numerous references in Pliny fall into the former category is bound to be, to a large extent, a subjective matter. Nevertheless, it can be assumed with some confidence that all scholars are likely to agree that the 860 passages listed in the Appendix do all present solid, historical data (for the period down to A.D. 14, that is). To these it would, no doubt, be possible to add still more of the sociological sort. But the passages of an indisputably factual and historical character are sufficiently numerous by themselves to justify one's using them to arrive at conclusions about Pliny as an historiographer. Their bona fides as admissible evidence, so to speak, cannot be challenged and, for that reason, they are the ones on which to place one's reliance and to base one's arguments.

The decision to limit the study to the period that ends with the year

A.D. 14 is due partly, but only partly, to the desirability of keeping it within manageable proportions. It is due in much greater degree to the inevitable break that exists between Rome of the Republic and Rome of the Empire and their respective histories, a break that is stressed by the ancient historians themselves.<sup>6</sup> True, Augustus is the first of the Roman emperors; but his early life and career belong to what is commonly recognized to be the last age of the Roman Republic, and even his later years might be regarded as having been passed in a kind of extension of the republican period: he fashioned the blue-print for, and laid the foundations of, the whole imperial system, and he started it on its way, as it were; but actually it was after his death in A.D. 14 that the Empire settled, under his successors, into its regular routine and assumed its characteristic aspect.

Moreover, Pliny himself was born not long after A.D. 14, in A.D. 23 actually, so that the history of the post-Augustan period was for him contemporary, or nearly contemporary, history. This, as we shall see, affected his approach to, and his attitude towards it. Evidently for him, as for his nephew,<sup>7</sup> contemporary history was different from earlier history, and he made the first century A.D. the real centre of his historical interests. This can be inferred from the fact that it was only to it that he thought it worthwhile to devote complete and separate works of history (as history is usually defined). Moreover, even in the Historia Naturalis there are proportionally many more historical references to the 65 years A.D. 14-79 (some 178) than to the 800 years preceding A.D. 14 (some 860). Pliny did undoubtedly think of himself as a historian, but especially as a contemporary historian, and he is careful to distinguish his Historia Naturalis,



which he regarded as only a collection of notes and excerpts<sup>8</sup>, from the purer type of history that he wrote on the first century A.D. Manifestly, then, he must have made the first century A.D. the subject of intensive and original research, something that he does not seem to have done for the earlier period of Roman history. This no doubt explains why Pliny as the contemporary historian of the first century A.D. has been so frequently studied, whereas Pliny the non-contemporary historian of the pre-Christian period has not.

Inevitably, therefore, any references in the Historia Naturalis to the times of the Julio-Claudians or of the Flavians are likely to be of a somewhat different quality from those that allude to earlier times. For that reason they are deserving of separate investigation in themselves. And this, of course, they have in fact received, not only in three unpublished theses<sup>9</sup> but also in the plethora of important and careful published studies on the unique and altogether invaluable list of communities making up the Roman Empire that is to be found in the geographical sections of the Historia Naturalis, Books 3 to 6 inclusive.<sup>10</sup>

It is true, of course, that Pliny's methods when alluding to imperial events can, and do, shed light on the practice he followed when making references to republican history; and the reverse is also true. Some account of this is taken in a later chapter. Nevertheless, for detailed study of individual historical references in the Historia Naturalis the year A.D. 14 does seem to make a reasonable as well as a convenient point of division.

Accordingly, this study is based chiefly on the 860 items in which Pliny supplies information relevant to Roman history from the foundation

of the city (or even earlier) to the year A.D. 14. Of these, some 511, that is almost two thirds of them, appear either partially or in their entirety in Pliny alone. Some of the 511 are indeed found elsewhere, but not in exactly the same form: the ancient authors who record them differ from Pliny in some detail or other. Thus only 349 items, in other words only about a third of all the references, are duplicated elsewhere in ancient literature. These duplications cannot, of course, be adduced as examples of what he has contributed to our knowledge of Roman history, unless we are to assume that these were all obtained by the other authors from Pliny (which certainly is not the case).<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, the fact that the overwhelming bulk of the historical information found in Pliny for our period, whether trivial or important, is not supported by any other ancient author makes some appraisal of his historiographical significance possible as well as desirable.

These references, then, provide information about Roman history, which, but for Pliny, would have been unknown; and it is worthwhile analyzing it to discover not only its character, but, if possible, Pliny's reasons for including it in the Historia Naturalis. Therefore the 511 passages in which Pliny provides otherwise unrecorded historical items are the prime object of study in this investigation; and henceforth they will simply be called "references".

About many of them, admittedly, little comment seems possible, since they seem unimportant in themselves and are obviously introduced in the most casual manner. Pliny, after all, was not writing the Historia Naturalis in order to provide historical information of the usual kind. Any historical references that have found their way into the work were brought in more

or less incidentally. To anticipate somewhat a conclusion set forth later, there does not, in fact seem to be any underlying pattern in Pliny's allusions to Roman history.

Inspection of the individual sections of his work does, however, seem to reveal one feature that is very common in the references: an interest in, and sometimes an almost exclusive concentration on, the unusual and the curious. This explains Pliny's predilection for recording omens, despite his own disclaimer that he is dealing with the works of nature and not with prodigies.<sup>12</sup> And perhaps even more marked is his fondness for drawing attention to the first time that something occurred.

The number of references in the different books of the Historia Naturalis varies considerably. Book I has no references at all. This is because it is really a table of contents: it describes the sections into which each of the other books of the Historia Naturalis is divided and it names the authorities, both Roman and foreign consulted by Pliny, either directly or indirectly. The other books all contain historical references, but many of these seem to be of minor importance. Book 2, which deals with cosmology, has 27 references, which are found only in Pliny, and a very large number of these are merely reports of portents, introduced in order to illustrate the phenomena being described. Books 3-6, dealing with geography, contain 35 references, which mostly mention incidents of a military nature that took place in the regions being described. Yet, it is clear that Pliny has preferred to record the initial penetration of areas hitherto unknown to the Romans, without, however, commenting on the historical consequences. Books 7-11 deal with zoology. The one devoted to the

human species, Book 7, inevitably contains very many references; in fact, it has no fewer than 88, more than any other book: they amount to almost one fifth of the total for the whole work. Yet a large number of them, contrary to what one would undoubtedly expect, do not relate military or political exploits and the like, but merely give instances of the unusual in human nature. In Books 8 to 11, dealing with animals, the 67 references are devoted particularly to the first appearance of certain animals in Rome, whether at games, in triumphs, or for food, and to the role which animals played in prodigies and in ill-omened sacrifices. The tendency of Books 12-19 is very similar. Their subject is botany and most of their 99 references simply record when particular plants were brought to Rome for the first time, either for food or for less vital purposes, such as the making of military decorations. Books 20-32, dealing with medicine, contain unexpectedly few references, only 44 in all. But these, too, for the most part are concerned with the first appearance of some disease, cure, or physician in Rome or Italy. Books 33-37 have minerals for their subject-matter, and many of their references (and, somewhat surprisingly, there are 151 of them)<sup>13</sup> likewise allude to the first appearance of some custom that required the use of stone or metal: marble, for instance, and gold rings are among the things mentioned.

References of this seemingly trivial kind cannot be automatically dismissed, of course, as insignificant. Portents have frequently played a very notable role in human history, and not least in Roman history; and strange and unfamiliar things have often had revolutionary effects on their first appearance in many parts of the world.<sup>14</sup> But where an item seems to have been introduced by Pliny merely because it is a novelty and where it is impossible for us with our fragmentary knowledge of the ancient world to

know clearly what repercussions, if any, it had on human behaviour and subsequent development, it can hardly be reckoned of much significance for our understanding of Roman history.

Pliny's importance as an historian, however, seems to lie not in the recondite knowledge that he displays about curiosities like these, but rather in the fact that he supplies much other and more substantial information which can by no means be classified under this head. It consists in many isolated and often brief references to, and a number of extended excursuses on, such items as: the Twelve Tables,<sup>15</sup> the controversy over the amount of gold paid by the Romans to the Gauls after the occupation of Rome in 390 B.C.,<sup>16</sup> the destruction of Volsinii by thunderbolt,<sup>17</sup> the price of oil at Rome at different periods,<sup>18</sup> the exploits of M. Sergius Silus (Catiline's greatgrandfather),<sup>19</sup> the amount of gold and silver in the treasury at Rome at various times,<sup>20</sup> Marius' assigning of the eagle to the Roman legions,<sup>21</sup> the quarrel between M. Drusus and Q. Caepio,<sup>22</sup> Sulla's destruction of Stabiae.<sup>23</sup> Among the important excursuses are the discovery of the books of Numa,<sup>24</sup> Roman coinage,<sup>25</sup> Gnaeus Flavius,<sup>26</sup> Pompey the Great,<sup>27</sup> Julius Caesar,<sup>28</sup> the Emperor Augustus,<sup>29</sup> the Equestrian Order.<sup>30</sup> References that deal with matters such as these are clearly of the greatest interest and consequence. And it is these references above all that will be investigated in some detail in this study, since it is through them that some estimate of Pliny's importance and value as a source of knowledge for the history of the Roman monarchy, of the Roman Republic, and of the first princeps becomes possible.

Of the 511 references that contain information found nowhere but in Pliny, those that deal with matters of genuine significance and substance and that can therefore fairly be regarded as Major References number more

than one hundred. The remainder, if not positively trivial, appear to be of little real consequence, although it has to be admitted that such a pronouncement about them is highly subjective. Some of them may not by any means seem as minor to everyone else as they do to the author of this study. To quote Pliny himself: "I am not unaware that most people will think that many things have been passed over, inasmuch as everybody has his own favourite."<sup>31</sup> Some of them, moreover, may be what one might call latent Major References, which new discoveries of an epigraphical, papyrological, numismatic or other archaeological character can suddenly invest with a hitherto unsuspected importance.<sup>32</sup>

In the present state of our knowledge, however, it does not seem possible to say very much, by way of comment, about these minor references. Their isolation and brevity permit neither an assessment about the reliability of their information nor serious conjecture about its implications for the study of Roman history as a whole. Accordingly, although they have all been listed in the Appendix to this study, they are not included in the review that follows in the next three chapters. Account is, however, taken of them in Chapters 5 and 6.

Of the many items of Roman history before A.D. 14 that Pliny refers to, 109 can be regarded as of major importance because of the importance of the information they supply. Their obvious consequence will immediately impress any reader of Pliny, and not merely the present author, and for that reason they are discussed in some detail in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. Some of them are referred to in more than one passage of the Historia Naturalis, and whenever that is the case all the references to the same item have been grouped together to form one composite reference, so to speak. This means

that, although Chapters 2, 3 and 4 deal with 109 items which for convenience will henceforth be called the Major References, they deal in fact with more than 109 passages of Pliny. They are serially numbered and listed in their chronological order (in so far as that can be determined), rather than in the order of their appearance in Pliny's text, in the conviction that this will enable the reader to appreciate more consecutively and more rapidly the extent to which our knowledge of the period before A.D. 14 is affected by statements found in him. Wherever possible, an attempt is made to relate each of the 109 Major References to its immediate historical context and to decide whether what it says seems accurate. When positive evidence or even extraneous considerations exist to indicate that what Pliny says does not deserve credence, the Reference will be described as untrustworthy. Of course, many References will not have this label attached to them. Not that that should be taken to mean that, in the writer's opinion, they are necessarily accurate. In many cases there is simply no means of knowing whether the information they supply is reliable or not. What it is hoped will emerge, however, is the conclusion that Pliny is a major source of information on Rome before the Christian era.

## Chapter 2

### Pliny on the Period before the Punic Wars

(1) 3.110: The Picentes derive their origin from the Sabines as the result of vowing a "Sacred Spring."

This prehistoric event, strictly speaking, does not belong to Roman history. But it is of obvious relevance to it, seeing that the Sabines were an element in the population of Rome. Pliny's belief that they were also the ancestors of the Picentes is manifestly due to popular etymology, Picentes being derived from picus, which bird was regarded as the animal that led out a band of Sabines to new lands on the occasion of a Sacred Spring.<sup>33</sup> The Sabine habit of celebrating a ver sacrum is, of course, abundantly attested.<sup>34</sup> Modern scholarship, however, reveals that there was a non-Sabine element in the Picentine population,<sup>35</sup> so that even though Pliny is probably giving the version normally current in his day, the information he supplies is not strictly accurate.

(2) 3.113: The Etruscans conquered 300 towns of the Umbrians.

This must have taken place in prehistoric times. The figure seems high, but the word oppida here means nothing more than "strongpoints."<sup>36</sup> The item is probably trustworthy. At any rate there was general agreement in antiquity that the Umbrians originally occupied a wider area than they did in historical times, having been compressed into a smaller territory by the arrival of newcomers, in other words, Etruscans (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, however, names Pelasgian immigrants from Thessaly as the intruders,



and Pliny in another passage agrees with him: but both Dionysius and Pliny may have identified Pelasgians with Etruscans).<sup>37</sup>

(3) 16.II: Hostus Hostilius, grandfather of King Tullus Hostilius, was crowned by Romulus with a garland of leaves for having been the first to enter Fidenae.<sup>38</sup>

A war against Fidenae traditionally took place in the latter part of Romulus' reign (753-717). The item seems untrustworthy, both because a war against Fidenae at that time seems unlikely<sup>39</sup> and also because it is possible that the exploits of Hostus Hostilius were later invented with an eye to the third king of Rome, the warlike Tullus Hostilius (who also is recorded as having fought against Fidenae).<sup>40</sup> Moreover, according to the usual annalistic tradition, Hostilius fell much earlier in a battle against the Sabines.<sup>41</sup>

(4) 3I.4I and 36.I2I: The Aqua Marcia was brought into Rome by King Ancus Marcius, and Q.Marcus Rex in his praetorship received an appropriation of money to repair it.

Ancus Marcius reigned traditionally from 640 to 616, and Q.Marcus Rex was praetor in I44. But Pliny's information is faulty. As he himself reveals elsewhere, the truth is that it was the praetor of I44, not the king of the seventh century, who built the Aqua Marcia. As praetor in I44 Q.Marcus Rex repaired some aqueducts already existing at that time (the Appia, the Anio Vetus and the Tepula, according to Pliny) and seized the occasion to build a new aqueduct, the Marcia.<sup>42</sup> But even for this more precise information, Pliny cannot be entirely trusted, since the Tepula was not built until I25; and Marcus Rex, accordingly, could not have

43  
 repaired it in 144.

(5) 31.89: Pliny asserts that King Ancus Marcius was the first to construct "salinae" or salt pools. Pliny adds that Ancus marked the occasion by giving a largess to the people of Rome of 6000 modii of salt.

44  
 The remark on the "salinae" is confirmed by Livy, but only Pliny refers to the largess. Varro seems to have been Pliny's authority here. Archaeological evidence certainly suggests an early date for the salt pools at the mouth of the Tiber; 45 there is some doubt, however, about the historicity of Ancus Marcius himself and certainly about most of the events associated with him. 46 Hence, even though one may accept the early dates for the salt-pools given by Livy and Pliny (i.e. they existed as early as the fourth king of Rome), there is no need to attribute them to 'Ancus Marcius'. There is no other evidence of a distribution of 6000 modii of salt by Ancus to the people, but something of the sort may have occurred. At any rate, the Marci were evidently claimed to have been benefactors of the people from an early date: 47 elsewhere Pliny records that Manius Marcius, when aedile of the plebs (ca.440), 48 was the first to provide the people with grain at the price of an as a modius. 49

(6) 3.70: According to Valerius Antias, Lucius Tarquinius (i.e. 50 Priscus) captured Apiolae, a town of the Latins, and used the spoils from there to begin building the Capitolium.

The date of the event is late seventh or early sixth century, since Tarquinius Priscus reigned traditionally from 616 to 578. Pliny's information seems to be inexact. For this his authority may be to blame, Valerius Antias being a notoriously unreliable author. But it seems more likely 51 that Pliny has merely been careless. According to Livy, the spoils

from Apiolae were used by Tarquinius Priscus to exhibit "games on a more splendid and elaborate scale than former kings had done," and the foundation of the Capitolium resulted from a war against Sabines rather than from a war against Latins.<sup>52</sup> The usual version had it that Suessa Pometia was the town from whose spoils the temple was constructed and that Tarquinius Superbus rather than Tarquinius Priscus was responsible for most of the building, so that Pliny may have confused Latin Apiolae with Volscian Pometia, and, if so, he has probably confused the two Tarquins as well. However, Livy does say that Tarquinius Priscus began the Capitoline temple, Tarquinius Superbus' role being to embellish it on a gorgeous scale with money raised from the sale of booty from Suessa Pometia, the town which he had captured from the Volsci. It looks as if Pliny at 3.70 is conveying traditional information, but has reported the name of the town incorrectly: elsewhere he himself knows that Pometia, not Apiolae, was the place concerned.<sup>53</sup>

(7) 34.I39: There was an express provision included in the treaty granted by Porsena to the Roman nation after the expulsion of the kings that they should use iron only for purposes of agriculture.

The treaty here referred to belongs, traditionally, to 510. It appears that Pliny, like Tacitus, believed that Porsena succeeded in capturing Rome.<sup>54</sup> Despite the heroic legends about Horatius Cocles, Mucius Scaevola and Cloelia, it looks as if Pliny and his antiquarian source is giving trustworthy information,<sup>55</sup> as opposed to the usual annalistic account, which would deny any such capture of Rome by the Etruscans.

(8) 16.I5: The XII Tables<sup>56</sup> laid it down that it was permissible to gather up acorns falling onto another person's land.

The date is 451/450. There is no known reason for distrusting the

accuracy of Pliny's information.

(9) 17.7: The XII Tables<sup>57</sup> stipulated that any person who cut down another's trees with harmful intent should pay a fine of 25 asses per tree.

Allusions in the imperial jurists<sup>58</sup> confirm that the XII Tables did contain such an item; and if Pliny is right about there being such an item he is presumably also right about the size of the fine.

(10) 18.12: The XII Tables<sup>59</sup> provided punishment by hanging for a person convicted of pasturing on, or secretly cutting by night, another's crops acquired by tillage.

This law is not positively known from other sources, but Aulus Gellius confirms that death by hanging was the punishment prescribed by the XII Tables<sup>60</sup> for at least some types of theft.

(11) 19.50: The word villa in the sense of 'farm' never occurs in the XII Tables,<sup>61</sup> hortus 'garden' always being used instead. The XII Tables described a garden by the word heredium 'family estate.'

Presumably this item is accurate: it finds support in a passage in Festus.<sup>62</sup>

(12) 18.15: The plebeian aedile Manius Marcius provided the people with grain at an as per modius for the first time.

The date is probably about the middle of the fifth century.<sup>63</sup> The already-noted tendency of the Marcii to present themselves as benefactors<sup>64</sup> of the people as early as the time of King Ancus Marcius argues against the trustworthiness of this early benefaction by one Manius Marcius.

(13) 3.125: According to Cornelius Nepos, Melpum, a particularly wealthy place, was destroyed by a mixed group of Insubres, Boii and Senones

on the same day that Camillus took Veii.

The event thus belongs to 396. Melpum seems to have been an Etruscan city, probably the most northerly one of the 12 cities that formed a league north of the Apennines; and, as Cornelius Nepos came from northern Italy, he could be expected to be well informed about a town in Transpadane Gaul. There is no doubt that the Celts took Melpum but whether they did it on the very day that the Romans took Veii we cannot say: it looks a little too coincidental. (Ancient historians were fond of such synchronisms, whether real or alleged).<sup>65</sup>

(14) I2.5: It is stated that the Gauls being imprisoned by the Alps as by a then insuperable bulwark, first found a motive for overflowing into Italy from the circumstance that a Gallic citizen from Switzerland named Helico, who had sojourned at Rome on account of his skill as an artificer, had brought with him when he came back some dried figs and grapes and some samples of oil and wine; and consequently, concluded Pliny, we may pardon them for having sought to obtain these things even by means of war.

Pliny thus gives a variant account of the Gallic incursion into Italy in 390. According to the annalistic tradition as given in Livy,<sup>66</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Plutarch, an inhabitant of Clusium in Etruria, named Arruns, angered by the seduction of his wife by another citizen of Clusium, Lucumo, had invited the Gauls into Italy to invade Clusium; and to entice them he had sent wine, hitherto unknown there, into Gaul. Pliny's account is an otherwise unknown version. Both versions of what brought the Gauls to Italy in 390 seem untrustworthy. This was not the first incursion of the Gauls into Italy, as even Livy is aware.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, the motive as given by Livy ("dulcedine frugum maximeque vini") is conventional

and is told of a quite different migration by Justin.<sup>68</sup> In truth, Ogilvie's statement that Livy's story is a romantic explanation, typical of the Hellenistic age, designed to account for the invasion of the Gauls,<sup>69</sup> can be applied equally well to the tale in Pliny.<sup>70</sup>

(15) 33.I4-I5: At Rome for a long time gold was actually not to be found at all except in very small amounts. At all events when peace had to be purchased after the capture of the City by the Gauls, not more than 1000 pounds weight of gold could be produced.<sup>71</sup> Admittedly, in Pompey's third consulship there was lost from the throne of the Capitoline Jupiter 2000 pounds weight of gold that had been stored there by Camillus, and this led to a general belief that 2000 pounds was the amount that had been accumulated. But really the additional sum was part of the booty taken from the Gauls; (the case of Torquatus shows that the Gauls were wont to wear gold ornaments in battle)<sup>72</sup> and it had been stripped by them from the temples in the part of the city which they had captured.<sup>73</sup> Therefore it appears that the gold belonging to the Gauls and that belonging to the temples did not amount to more than that total; and this in fact was taken to be the meaning contained in the augury, when Jupiter Capitolinus had paid back twofold.

Pompey's third consulship was in 52, but Pliny is referring to the Gallic sack of Rome ca. 390. On that occasion, according to some sources,<sup>74</sup> the Gauls were bought off with 1000 lbs. of gold.<sup>75</sup> Varro<sup>76</sup> and Dionysius, however, give the amount as 2000 lbs. (i.e. 25 talents). Other authorities also suggest that the gold deposited by Camillus exceeded that which had been paid to and subsequently recovered from the Gauls.<sup>77</sup>

Pliny is clearly seeking to explain the figure 2000 in Varro and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Pliny customarily takes his historical references

from his sources without comment. This is one of the comparatively few passages in the Historia Naturalis where he questions them. Seeing that one of them this time was Varro, who as we shall see was Pliny's regular and principal source, he must have felt very certain of his ground to depart from his customary practice. In fact by Pliny's day, the tale of the extra 1000 pounds of gold seems to have come into vogue: Lucan<sup>78</sup> refers to the treasure which the Gallic leader Brennus abandoned in his hasty retreat from Rome (in the context this must refer to wealth not originally belonging to Rome but acquired from one of her enemies); and Petronius<sup>79</sup> seems to be alluding to it in his enigmatic remark about the Senate often promising 1000 lbs. in gold to the Capitolium. Even so, the story that the Romans recovered gold from the Gauls sounds like patriotic fiction.

(16) 33.I6: There were at most only 2000 lbs. of gold in Rome when the city was captured in its 364th. year, although the census showed that there were already 152,573 free citizens. Yet 307 years later, when the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was burned down, the younger Marius transferred 14,000 lbs. of gold from Rome and other temples to Praeneste.<sup>80</sup> In the following year all this gold was back in Rome, being exhibited there in Sulla's triumphal procession, along with 6000 pounds of silver. Beside this, Sulla had carried in his procession of the previous day 15,000 lbs. of gold and 115,000 lbs. of silver representing the proceeds from his other victories.

This figure for the census in 390 shows that Pliny, at any rate, believed that even at this early date Rome already had a considerable body of free citizens, certainly enough to warrant surprise at the scarcity of gold among such a sizeable body. That Rome was already a large place seems certain, but the census figure itself should be accepted, if indeed at all,

only with the utmost reservation, as Toynbee clearly demonstrates. On<sup>81</sup>  
 the other hand, Pliny's figures for the gold and silver in Rome in 82 and  
 81 are credible enough. From what we know of Rome's income in gold and  
 silver from booty in the period between 390 and 81,<sup>82</sup> Pliny's figures seem  
 by no means unreasonable and should be trusted.<sup>83</sup>

(17) 3.98: There was once, according to Theopompus, a city in  
 Lucania named Mardonia, in which Alexander of Epirus died.

The date was ca.330.<sup>84</sup> The item is untrustworthy. Mardonia was in  
 Messapic territory,<sup>85</sup> not in Lucania; and, in any event, Alexander probably  
 did not die there but at Pandosia<sup>86</sup> (which, incidentally, did happen to be in  
 Lucania). The origin of the confusion is evidently due to Alexander's being  
 mistaken for another of the Tarentine mercenaries of the period: Archidamus III,  
 King of Sparta and son of Agesilaus, who did indeed die near Mardonia in  
 338.<sup>87</sup> It seems more likely to have been Pliny than Theopompus who confused<sup>88</sup>  
 the two, since he is guilty of this kind of confusion on other occasions.

(18) 3.57: Cleitarchus reported that the Romans sent a delegation  
 to Alexander the Great.

The date would be ca.325<sup>89</sup> and the place Babylon (Cleitarchus was pro-  
 bably there with Alexander). While Pliny himself apparently accepts the  
 historicity of the item, it is, nevertheless, probably untrustworthy. This<sup>90</sup>  
 is the opinion of most modern scholars, although it is impossible to prove<sup>91</sup>  
 the matter conclusively one way or the other. However, Diodorus, the earliest  
 extant source to deal with the missions to Alexander ("from practically all<sup>92</sup>  
 the inhabited world") fails to include the Romans in his list; and Arrian,  
 who spends over half of his account of these missions in an attempt to dis-  
 prove any Roman participation therein, states that neither any Roman writer



nor his chief Greek sources, Ptolemy and Aristobulus, mention the mission. He omits any reference to Cleitarchus in this connection (Cleitarchus' reputation as an historian was not high among the ancients) and, instead, says that the story is found only in two (utterly obscure) historians, Aristus and Asclepiades. The mention of the story by Cleitarchus, Aristus and Asclepiades indicates that, at least, such a tradition existed; moreover, <sup>93</sup> Strabo, suggests that there was some contact between Alexander and the Romans. Arrian, however, decided to dispel the rumour once and for all by pointing out that no reputable historian believed it. The evidence, such as it is, seems against Pliny.

(19) 7.I33: In the whole of history, only one family can be found to have produced three successive principes senatus, that of the Fabii: M.Fabius Ambustus, (Q) Fabius (Maximus) Rullianus his son, and Q.Fabius (Maximus) Gurges his grandson.

Pliny alone gives us this information about the 4th. and 3rd. centuries. The respective tenures of the office by the three Fabii are not certainly known, but there seems no reason to disbelieve Pliny's assertion that they succeeded one another as principes senatus. The Fabii were patri-<sup>94</sup> cians and therefore eligible for the office. Certainly all three men were members of the senate, Ambustus having been consul in 360, 356, 354, Rullianus in 322, 310, 308, 297, 295, and Gurges in 292 and 276.<sup>95</sup> Pliny's information is important, for it suggests that the Fabii were the predominant senatorial family throughout the Samnite Wars. It also points to a resurgence of the Fabii after the disaster at the Cremera River in 477, in which <sup>96</sup> three hundred members of their clan are said to have perished.

(20) 7.I36: L.Fulvius Curvus, who had been consul of the Tusculans

at the time of their revolt from Rome, also became consul of the Romans after he went over to them: he was the only man who ever celebrated a triumph over the people whose consul he had been in the same year.

The date referred to must be 322, since Fulvius was consul at Rome in that year. The Fulvii were a Tusculan gens, and this L.Fulvius Curvus was the first member of the gens to win the Roman consulship. But Pliny is in error in thinking that he celebrated a triumph over Tusculum in 322. His triumph that year was at the expense of the Samnites. Pliny's mistake may then be due to confusion between Tusculans and Samnites, or, possibly, confusion between Fulvius the consul of 322 and Flavius the plebian tribune of 323, who sought to have the Tusculans condemned for aiding Velitrae and Privernum.

(21) 34.23: The Romans set up a statue to Q.Marcus Tremulus; he had twice vanquished the Samnites, and, by taking Anagnia, delivered the people from payment of war-tax.

The date is 306, and the item about the war-tax is found nowhere else. It is impossible to say whether it is trustworthy. In any case, the relief from the war-tax can only have been temporary. With respect to the other information, however, Pliny's account is confusing. Other sources tell us that Marcus defeated the Hernici and helped his fellow consul of 306, P.Cornelius Arvina, to defeat the Samnites. In saying that Marcus Tremulus had defeated the Samnites on two occasions, neither of which can be certainly identified, and that his capture of Anagnia, the chief town of the Hernici, relieved the Romans of the necessity of paying the war-tax, Pliny is probably guilty of error. It is to be noted, however, that although he says that Marcus had 'defeated' the Samnites twice, he does not say that

he 'triumphed' over them (that honour was reserved for M.Fulvius Curvus Paetinus in 305). The Fasti ad ann. 306 list only one triumph for Marcius Tremulus, "de Anagnineis Herniceis(que)."<sup>104</sup>

(22) 33.I7-I8: Gnaeus Flavius, the son of a freedman and himself a scriba of Appius Claudius Caecus, at the request of the latter, first published the pontifical calendar (i.e. the dies fasti); this won him such popularity with the common people (who up till then had been able to learn dates for transacting legal proceedings only by daily enquiry from some of the leading men) that he was appointed curule aedile, being tribune of the plebs at the same time. His colleague was Q.Anicius of Praeneste, who had been an enemy of Rome a few years earlier. The defeated candidates were Gaius Poetilius and (Cn.) Domitius (Calvinus), both of whom were the sons of former consuls.<sup>105</sup><sup>106</sup><sup>107</sup><sup>108</sup>

This happened, as Pliny is careful to point out, in the consulship of P.Sempronius and L.Sulpicius, i.e. in 304. He is following the traditional account, but differs in certain details. Other authorities also tell us that Flavius published the calendar at the urging of Appius, this being part of Appius' wider campaign against the nobiles, although no other source names Flavius' colleague or the defeated candidate Gaius Poetilius. Livy follows the annalist, Licinius Macer, and records that Flavius published the calendar when he was already aedile; Pliny, however, (and in this he is supported by Pomponius), suggests that the aedileship came afterwards, as an honour. Pliny's version seems preferable, since it is taken from the oldest annals. It is to be noted that, according to Pliny, Flavius was a tribune of the plebs at the same time that he was curule aedile, whereas Livy (that is, Licinius Macer) says that Flavius<sup>109</sup><sup>110</sup><sup>111</sup><sup>112</sup><sup>113</sup><sup>114</sup><sup>115</sup><sup>116</sup><sup>117</sup>

had been tribune prior to being curule aedile. The two versions are not necessarily incompatible, since Flavius might have been aedile from March 304 to March 303 and tribune from December 305 to December 304, thus holding both offices between March 304 and December 304. But it is probably preferable to believe, with Mommsen, that the accumulation of plebeian and patrician offices under the Republic was impossible and that, therefore, Pliny is in error on this point. Pliny is also in error on another point. He and the tradition alike are under the mistaken impression that Flavius' publication of the calendar marked a break with the past and the beginning of a new era, but as Fritz Schulz notes: "The calendar was no secret; neither were the processual formularies which, for generations past, suitors had obtained from the pontiffs in writing or by dictation or by prompting in court. If they had been pontifical secrets, neither Appius Claudius nor Cn.Flavius could have published them, seeing that neither of them was a member of the college. What is more important, the mere publication of the formularies would not teach the juristic technique which had drafted them."

(23) 34.32: The first statue publicly erected at Rome by foreigners was the one in honour of the tr. plebis Gaius Aelius: he had introduced a law against Sthenius Stallius, the Lucanian, who had twice made an attack upon Thurii; for this, the people of Thurii presented Aelius with a statue and a crown of gold; and the same people afterwards presented (Gaius) Fabricius (Luscinius) with a statue for having rescued them from a state of siege.

Thurii was menaced in 285 by the Lucanians and obtained an alliance with Rome. Gaius Aelius, tr. plebis, however, is known only from this passage of Pliny, and so also is his law. Broughton puts him as tr. plebis

in 285. However, a Gaius Aelius Paetus was consul in 286. Furthermore, it seems more likely that a law about peace or war would be passed by the centuriate assembly than by the concilium plebis. It looks, then, as if Pliny here is guilty of a slip of memory, calling Aelius tribune instead of consul. Nothing else, moreover, is known of the statue decreed to Fabricius. In 282 Fabricius, when consul, roundly defeated the Lucanians and Bruttians and relieved Thurii.<sup>122</sup> According to Valerius Maximus the enemy leader (in 282) was called Statius Statilius.<sup>123</sup> He may be different from Sthennius Stallius, but the resemblance of the two names and the fact that Pliny mentions two incursions of the Lucanians against Thurii (285, 282?) permits one to suppose that they are the same person.<sup>124</sup>

(24) 33.38: L.Lentulus as consul awarded a gold crown to Servius Cornelius Merenda (consul in the following year) for the capture of a town from the Samnites.

Lentulus was consul in 275, and Merenda's exploit was evidently achieved during Lentulus' defeat of the Caudini, the Samnite tribe over whom he triumphed in 275.<sup>125</sup> The item seems trustworthy. L.Calpurnius Piso is the probable source.<sup>126</sup>

(25) 18.12; 33.42-47, 132; 34.1 (together these texts give Pliny's summarized history of Roman coinage): The coinage of the Roman state is on a bronze standard (34.1). At first, according to Timaeus, the Romans used unmarked lumps of bronze, aes rude (33.43); in the reign of King Servius aes signatum was introduced (18.12; 33.43); at some time before King Pyrrhus' defeat the Romans were already using aes grave, the libral as (33.42); the Romans first coined silver in 269, tariffing it at the rate

of 10 asses to the denarius (33.44); in the First Punic War, the as was reduced to two ounces, the sextantal as (33.44); at some time the silver victoriante was introduced from Illyria (33.46); gold coins were first struck in 218/217 (or, according to some MSS, in 202/201)(33.47); the as was reduced again in 217 to one ounce, the uncial as, tariffed at the rate of 16 asses to the denarius (except for soldiers who could still get a denarius for only 10 asses) (33.45); by a Lex Papiria, the as was reduced to half an ounce, the semiuncial as (33.46); the denarius should contain  $\frac{1}{84}$  of a pound of silver (33.132); but Livius Drusus, when tribune of the plebs, reduced the weight of silver in the coin (33.46); further debasements were carried out by the triumvir Mark Antony and others (33.132), and by the Roman Emperors, by Nero very recently, so that under him a pound of gold cost 45 denarii, instead of the previous 40 (33.47).

127

This is the locus classicus and virtually the only account from antiquity for the history of the Roman coinage under the Republic. The only sure way of checking its accuracy is to compare what Pliny says with the evidence of the coins themselves. The numismatists (and their number is legion) who have done this are unanimous in declaring Pliny wrong on many points. The development of Roman coinage, as revealed by the coins themselves, seems to have been as follows:

128

some time after 450, aes rude introduced

later still, aes signatum

ca. 289, aes grave (heavy)

ca. 289, earliest Roman silver (type: Mars/Horse's Head ROMANO)

ca. 240, aes grave (light)

ca. 235, silver quadrigati (type: legend ROMA incused)

ca. 218, earliest gold (type: oath scene/Janus)  
 semilibral as (type: Ship's prow/Janus)

ca. 213, Victoriatus (silver)

ca. 211, denarius (silver), marked x (=10 asses to denarius)

2nd cent., sextantal as

Gracchan period, denarius (silver), marked \* (=16 asses to denarius)

It is very clear that, although there is a mass of information in Pliny, it is badly digested. It is universally admitted that he is wrong in attributing a role to King Servius Tullius in connection with the Roman coinage; his account of the successive reductions of the as also seems seriously in error. He does rather better with the precious metals, silver and gold (and Livy supports him on the date for the earliest silver), although it looks as if he is ignorant of any silver coin other than the denarius (and multiples thereof) and therefore thinks that the earliest Roman silver coins were denarii (which, in fact, they were not). It may be that Pliny used denarius in a generic as well as in a literal sense, and therefore could apply it to any silver coin (he actually talks in one place about a gold denarius).

But even though Pliny has gone astray on details, he has done an immense service for Roman history in saying anything at all about the history of the coinage. Thanks to him, numismatists have been provided with fixed points of reference; without him the task of building a chronological table for Roman coins would be even more difficult than it is. Finally, it is only right to point out that the coins prove him right on a number of points: on the coin types for the as and the denarius; and on a debasement of the denarius in the time of Nero.

(26) 3.II0: 360,000 Picentes were made subject to Rome.

This incident must belong to 268, the year in which Picenum was reduced, in a single campaign, by the consuls Sempronius Sophus and Appius Claudius, both of whom celebrated the victory with triumphs "de Peicentibus".<sup>134</sup><sup>135</sup>

This incident has been referred by scholars to 299, when the Romans, alarmed by the rumour of a Gallic rising, while they were already at war with the Etruscans, immediately concluded a treaty with the people of Picenum.<sup>136</sup> However, a treaty freely entered into is unlikely to be meant by the words "in fidem p.R. venere." The causes which led to the war in 269/268 are unknown (Eutropius names the Picentes as the aggressors in the year before), but there is no reason to doubt its historicity: indeed, this may have been the occasion when the Romans transferred some of the people of Picenum across the peninsula to the coast near Salernum.<sup>137</sup> The figure given by Pliny seems high, but it may be trustworthy.



### Chapter 3

Pliny on the Period from the Punic Wars to the end of the Social War

(27) 34.34: Metrodorus of Scepsis reproached Rome with having taken by storm the city of Volsinii for the sake of the 2000 statues which it contained.

The reference is probably to the capture of Volsinii by Rome in <sup>138</sup>264 and is important since it shows the kind of motive Metrodorus thought it plausible to attribute to Rome. He was certainly no lover of Rome (he was called <sup>139</sup>*μισορωμαῖος*), and it seems unlikely that the Romans stormed a town merely to loot its statues. Other sources say that Rome's motive was to <sup>140</sup>assist the lords of Volsinii against their serfs, who had revolted.

(28) 2.139: Volsinii, the wealthiest town of the Etruscans was entirely burnt up by a thunderbolt.

Volsinii was indeed destroyed (in 264, actually), but by a Roman <sup>141</sup>army, according to other sources; and these other sources seem much more <sup>142</sup>likely to be correct. Even Pliny elsewhere 34.34 admits this. Roman writers, possibly for reasons of euphemism or metaphor, were prone to blame lightning <sup>143</sup>as the cause of death and destruction. Pliny may be attributing the destruction of the town to natural causes rather than to the Roman army for reasons of patriotism, thereby giving Metrodorus of Scepsis the lie, but more probably he is seeking a natural as distinct from a human agency for the event, because that would appear more suitable in a work on natural <sup>144</sup>history. In any case, the two versions are not absolutely and necessarily

inconsistent with one another. On the whole, the item is not very trustworthy.

(29) 16.I92: In the First Punic War the fleet commanded by Duilius was on the water within 60 days after the timber had left the tree; and, according to Piso, the fleet of 200 ships that fought against King Hiero<sup>145</sup> was built in 45 days.<sup>146</sup> In the Second Punic War Scipio's fleet sailed on the 40th day after the timber had been felled.

The first and last points are both noted elsewhere, in Florus<sup>147</sup> and Livy<sup>148</sup> respectively. But the item which Pliny obtained from the annalist L.Calpurnius Piso<sup>149</sup> is otherwise unknown. It belongs to the year 264 and seems trustworthy.

(30) 22.II: The military tribune M.Calpurnius Flamma won the corona graminea for his exploits in Sicily.

Calpurnius Flamma's exploits in 258 are recorded in several other sources,<sup>150</sup> but only Pliny reports the awarding of the corona. Pliny's account seems trustworthy, especially as the circumstances of Calpurnius' deed correspond with the conditions under which the corona graminea was customarily awarded.<sup>151</sup>

(31) 15.2; 18.I7: According to M.Varro, at the time when a procession of a very large number of elephants accompanied L.Metellus in his triumph, the price of a peck of emmer wheat was one as, as also was that of a gallon of wine, 30 pounds of dried figs, 10 pounds of oil and 12 pounds of meat. Such was the scale of prices when the state already had some luxury.

The date referred to is 250.<sup>152</sup> The figures given by Pliny and his source Varro seem to be wrong; and they do not appear to be textually corrupt, since all the MSS agree on them. Elsewhere Pliny reports that the year after 250 was a time of declining prices for oil, which was becoming

more and more plentiful: yet he quotes the price of oil in 249 <sup>153</sup> as 10 asses for 12 pounds, in other words ten times higher than the year before. The 1 as for 10 pounds figure evidently belongs to a later day when the price of oil had dropped further. Cicero <sup>154</sup> tells us that it was the price prevailing in 74 when M.Seius, son of Lucius, was curule aedile. How Pliny and Varro came to give the low price for oil in 250 we have no means of knowing, but one cannot help but wonder whether Pliny has misquoted Varro or whether the figure 1 as in his text may not in fact be corrupt after all.

(32) 7.19: There are a few families in the Faliscan territory, not far from the city of Rome, named the Hirpi, which at the yearly sacrifice to Apollo performed on Mount Soracte walk over a charred pile of logs without being scorched, and consequently under a perpetual decree of the Senate they enjoy exemption from military service and all other burdens.

<sup>155</sup>  
The Hirpi are known from other sources, but only Pliny records the senatorial decree that made them a privileged group. Their custom of fire-walking must have been very old. But there is no certain way of telling when the Senate passed the decree: perhaps it was at the time when Falerii (the capital of the Falisci) became Roman, whenever that was (in 241?).

(33) 18.286: The Roman people, according to Varro, in the year 238 instituted the festival of the Floralia in obedience to the Sibyl's oracles.

The antiquarian tradition, here represented by Pliny (following Varro), gives the year of the institution of the Floralia as 238, and all the MSS agree on this reading ("urbis anno DXVI"). This tradition seems at variance with that recorded by Vel<sup>156</sup>ius Paterculus, in the same year as the foundation <sup>157</sup> of the colony at Spoletium, viz. in 241. But perhaps the two authors can be reconciled. Vel<sup>157</sup>ius' colony foundation dates often differ by a few years

from those of other authors, and this may be the cause of his early date for the institution of the Floralia.

(34) 7.I39: L.Caecilius Metellus, in addition to holding other offices, was on one occasion XV vir agris dandis. Furthermore, after losing his sight while rescuing the Palladium from a fire in the Temple of Vesta, he received from the people the completely unparalleled privilege of being permitted to drive to meetings of the senate in a chariot.

The exact dates of these events are unknown, but it has been conjectured that Metellus (who was consul in 251,247) may have been XV vir in 232. Not all of what Pliny says here seems literally correct: at any rate, according to Aulus Gellius, there had been other instances of men going to senate meetings in chariots.

(35) 16.I4: Scipio Africanus rescued his father at the Trebia River, and for this he was offered the corona civica, which he refused.

The incident occurred in 218, and is mentioned elsewhere, although only Pliny records the rejected offer of the corona civica. If the young Scipio did not get the corona civica, then the rival tradition, not mentioned by Pliny but recorded by Coelius Antipater, that it was a Ligurian slave who rescued Scipio's father, is strengthened. Furthermore, the usual account was that the incident took place at the Ticinus, not the Trebia. On the whole, Pliny's statement seems untrustworthy.

(36) 22.I0: By the unanimous vote of the Senate and the Roman People, Q.Fabius Maximus was awarded the corona graminea when Hannibal was driven out of Italy.

If Pliny is right, Fabius received the award just before his death. But Pliny may not be right. Gellius also records the award, saying, however, that it was made "because Fabius had freed Rome from enemy siege,"

presumably in 211. <sup>164</sup> Pliny, then, may have mistakenly said Italia when he meant Roma.

(37) 7.I04-06: The colleagues of the praetor M. Sergius (Silus) attempted to debar him from the sacrifices because of his physical disabilities, which were due to his many war wounds, but he defended himself in a speech listing his many exploits and campaigns in different regions against <sup>165</sup> Hannibal.

<sup>166</sup> Sergius Silus was praetor in 197 and what Pliny tells us about him is of great interest, since he happened to be Catiline's great-grandfather. <sup>167</sup> For Pliny Sergius was one of the great heroes of the Republic, whereas Livy merely gives routine details about his praetorship. Sergius Silus' speech of 197 may have been Pliny's source, but there is no obvious reason for <sup>168</sup> rejecting Pliny's testimony (unless pronepos is a mistake for abnepos).

(38) 19.I56: (Gaius) Cornelius Cethegus, the colleague of Quinctius Flaminius in the consulship, gave honied wine flavoured with rue to the public after the election had been concluded.

This item is to be regarded with suspicion. Cornelius stood in 198 for election to the consulship of 197. The statement that he had Flaminius <sup>169</sup> for his consular colleague in 197 is wrong: his colleague was rather Q. Minucius Rufus (Flaminius was consul in 198).

(39) 7.I20: Although P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica was judged <sup>170</sup> by the Senate to be once and for all the finest man since the beginning of time, he was not permitted to die in his native land.

The date of Scipio Nasica's death is unknown. The last thing certainly known about him is that he served as patron in the Spanish inquiry of 171. If the item about his death in exile is trustworthy there is a curious

coincidence between his end and that of Scipio Africanus or, again, that of P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, who, after engineering the death of Tiberius Gracchus in 133, retired to Pergamum on a mission and there died.<sup>171</sup> It is unfortunate that Pliny does not say precisely where Nasica ended his life.

(40) 33.I38: The Roman people began pouring out donations in the consulship of Spurius Postumius and Quintus Marcius when they contributed funds to help Lucius Scipio defray the cost of the games, which he celebrated in fulfilment of a vow that he had made during the war with Antiochus III.<sup>172</sup>

The war with Antiochus III was victoriously concluded in 190; Lucius Scipio celebrated his triumph in 186; and Postumius and Marcius were consuls in that year. Pliny's point is that this was not the first example of such a donation but rather the first on such a lavish scale. The great influx of wealth from Scipio's Asian conquests of 190 undoubtedly made such an outpouring possible.<sup>173</sup> Therefore there is no reason to doubt Pliny's accuracy.

(41) 3.I3I: According to L. Piso, M. Claudius Marcellus destroyed a town 12 miles from Aquileia.

This incident evidently occurred in 183 when Marcellus, as consul, was sent to oppose the unauthorized settlement of Transalpine Gauls near Aquileia.<sup>174</sup> Continuing fear of a tumultus Gallicus accounts for this Roman refusal to countenance a renewed Gallic intrusion into Italy. The Gauls were compelled to return across the Alps taking their moveable property with them, and the Senate decided to establish a Latin colony at Aquileia.<sup>175</sup> It was duly planted in 181.<sup>176</sup> The detail that Marcellus not only expelled the intruding Gauls but also destroyed their settlement, and did so against

the wishes of the Senate, is found only in Pliny and may mean that Piso, Pliny's source, was seeking to denigrate Marcellus. In any case, there is no reason to disbelieve the information supplied by the reference.

(42) I3.84-7: Cassius Hemina, an historian of great antiquity, stated in Book 4 of his Annales that the scriba Cn. Terentius, when digging over his land on the Janiculum, turned up a coffer that had contained the body of Numa, who was king at Rome, and that in the same coffer were found some books of his. This was in the consulship of P.Cornelius Cethegus and M.Baebius Tamphilus, 535 years after the accession of Numa; and the historian added that the books were made of paper, which he considered remarkable. These books contained the philosophical doctrines of Pythagoras, and Hemina said that the books had been burnt by the praetor Q.Petilius. The same story is recorded, with certain variations, by other writers, Piso, Tuditanus, Varro and Antias.

177

The date is 181, and other writers mention the incident. Livy, 178  
 Valerius Maximus, Plutarch, Festus, Lactantius, Auctor de viris illustribus, 179 180 181 182  
 and St. Augustine (who names Varro as his source) all describe the finding of the books of Numa. But no two of the versions agree in their entirety. The variations fall roughly into two groups: the Livian tradition, followed by Valerius Maximus, Plutarch and Lactantius, makes L.Petilius the finder of the books; the Varronian tradition, followed by Pliny, St. Augustine, 183  
 Festus and the Auctor de viris illustribus, names Cn. Terentius. Pliny 184  
 gives no important detail that is not found in at least one of the other sources; but his account, even if not the most detailed (Livy's having that distinction), is a source of additional knowledge for us, in that it tells us who were the sources for the story. Pliny's main source, the oldest of 185  
 all, is Cassius Hemina, whom he describes as "vetustissimus auctor annalium"

and elsewhere (29.12) as "Cassius Hemina ex antiquissimis auctor..."<sup>186</sup> For some of the details, he names Hemina again, Piso, Tuditanus, Antias, and Varro. Pliny's unusual exactness in thus citing a series of authorities and the number of books of Numa given by each is probably due to his refusal to accept some detail in Varro.<sup>187</sup> Perhaps he should have carried his scepticism about Varro still further. The tradition that it was Terentius who found the books may simply be due to an attempt to glorify the gens Terentia, of which Varro was a member.

(43) 8.64: An old senatus consultum forbade the importation of Africanæ (leopards?) into Italy. It was repealed by a law of the people sponsored by the tr. plebis Cn. Aufidius, and importation of the animal for Circus games was allowed.

The tribunate of Cn. Aufidius may belong to 170.<sup>188</sup> Livy's notice that in the following year 169 there were exhibited Africanæ (in addition to bears and elephants) suggests that Pliny's statement is trustworthy.

(44) 34.24: Cn. Octavius led a mission to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, king of Syria, whom the Senate wished to prevent from making war on Egypt.

The date is 168, and the usual account is that the mission was headed by C. Popillius Laenas.<sup>189</sup> This may be part of the propaganda attempt to supply Octavius of Velitrae (the later Augustus) with illustrious male ancestors,<sup>190</sup> but it is also possible that Pliny has simply got the monarch's name wrong. Octavius did lead an embassy to Syria, but to Antiochus V Eupator, not Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Unlike Popillius, who returned unharmed from his mission to Antiochus IV Epiphanes (despite a display of arrogance), Octavius did not come back: he was assassinated at Laodicea in 163 and the Romans erected a statue to him in the Forum.<sup>191</sup> In confusing the two missions,<sup>192</sup> Pliny is guilty of carelessness.



(45) 33.55-56: The aerarium at Rome contained 17,410 pounds of gold and 22,070 in silver bullion and 6,135,400 sesterces in cash when Sextus Julius (Caesar) and Lucius Aurelius (Orestes) were consuls, seven years before the Third Punic War; there were 1,620,831 pounds of silver and an uncertain amount of gold (the MS is deficient), when Sextus Julius (Caesar) and Lucius Marcius (Philippus) were consuls at the beginning of the Social War. When Gaius (Julius) Caesar got to Rome in the Civil War, he withdrew from the aerarium 15,000 gold ingots, 30,000 silver ingots, and 30,000,000 sesterces in coin.

The three dates referred to are 157, 91 and 49 respectively, and the figures given, if trustworthy, are obviously important. The sums that Pliny lists for Julius Caesar receive some confirmation from Lucan, who  
193  
(alone of our sources) gives the provenance of the various, considerable deposits of treasure stored up in the aerarium before Caesar broke it open. It is to be noted that for each of the three years referred to, a Caesar is directly or indirectly involved, culminating with Julius Caesar himself. (the Caesars of 157, 91 were the only ancestors of Julius Caesar who attained the consulship). Pliny's remark that "at no other periods was the state  
194  
more wealthy" was, apparently, picked up by Lucan, who concludes his description of Caesar's plundering of the aerarium with the words: "This was the first time that Rome became poorer than a Caesar." Perhaps both Pliny and Lucan are thinking of the Principate when there was normally more money in the treasury (fiscus) of the Caesar than in the Public Treasury (aerarium Saturni).

195

(46) I7.244: According to the annalist L.Piso, from the censorship of M.Valerius Messalla and C.Cassius Longinus onwards morality was undermined.

The year referred to is 154. Evidently Pliny subscribes to Velleius' <sup>196</sup> view about the deleterious effects of a stone theatre upon the moral well-being of Rome. Other writers suggest different dates for the beginning of Roman degeneracy. <sup>197</sup> Needless to say, Pliny is no more trustworthy a witness than the others.

(47) 7.II2-13: Cato the Censor, on the occasion when the famous embassy of the three leaders of philosophy was sent from Athens, after hearing Carneades advised that these envoys should be sent away as soon as possible, because when Carneades was discoursing it was difficult to distinguish where the truth lay. Cato always on other occasions recommended the total banishment of Greeks from Italy.

Cato's advice that the three philosophers of 155 should be sent away from Rome is known from other sources, but only Pliny mentions his perennial <sup>198</sup> insistence that all Greeks should be banished from Italy. The item seems trustworthy.

(48) 5.9-10: Pliny gives a description of Polybius' celebrated <sup>199</sup> voyage beyond the Pillars of Hercules and down the coast of Africa. <sup>200</sup>

It probably occurred in 146. Polybius himself alludes to this voyage in his history, without, however, supplying any details. Whether Pliny has the details right we cannot say, but his statement that Scipio <sup>201</sup> Aemilianus backed the expedition is in line with what is known about Scipio's relations with Polybius.

(49) 33.I4I: Scipio Aemilianus paraded 4370 pounds of silver in his triumphal procession after the conquest of Carthage, this being the total amount of silver owned by that city. Furthermore, after destroying Numantia, <sup>202</sup> Scipio gave a largess of seven denarii a head to his troops at his triumph.

203

His brother Q.Fabius Allobrogicus, was the first person ever to own 1000 pounds of silver. The pleb<sup>e</sup>ian tribune Livius Drusus had no less than 10,000 pounds of silver.

The dates concerned are, respectively, 146, 132, 121 and 91.

Whether the items concerning Scipio and Fabius are trustworthy it is impossible to say, but that concerning Drusus does seem probable since he was reputedly the wealthiest man in Rome in 91.

(50) 3.I29: Tuditanus, the conqueror of the Istrians, set up a statue of himself in their territory, bearing the inscription: "From Aquileia to the River Tityus 2000 stades."

The Tuditanus referred to is C.Sempronius Tuditanus, consul in 129. He was certainly active in the Istrian peninsula, since the fragments of an inscription mention him; incidentally, they also name the river. Hence the item looks trustworthy, even if it is curious for a Roman monument to use a Greek measure of distance.

(51) 34.3I: In Rome a statue was set up to Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi.

206

The date of the statue can be fixed only approximately: Plutarch, referring to incidents in the year of Gaius Gracchus' first tribunate (123), says that the people honoured his mother Cornelia by erecting later a statue in her honour, setting it up (as Pliny says) in the Portico of Metellus, which subsequently was replaced by the Porticus Octaviae. The latter burned down (as Dio informs us) in A.D. 80, and probably the statue (though not its base) perished at the same time. Pliny's reliability is confirmed by the fact that the base of the statue can still be seen in the Museo dei Conservatori on the Capitoline.

208

(52) 28.I2;30.I2: There is extant the plea of innocence uttered by the Vestal Tuccia when, accused of unchastity, she carried water in a sieve in the year of the city 519 (=235BC). A later generation indeed saw buried in the Forum Boarium a Greek man and a Greek woman, and victims from other peoples with whom at that time the Romans were at war.

Pliny is led into describing this incident of a burial rite in the Forum Boarium by his discussion of the fate that awaited unchaste Vestals (the case of Tuccia is known from other sources also). The rite consisted of consulting the Sibylline books and then burying 2 Greeks and 2 Gauls (2 of each sex) in the Forum Boarium. The rite may not have been a sacrifice of war, as this passage of Pliny has led many to think, but was perhaps rather connected with some lapse in virtue on the part of a Vestal Virgin. Such instances of human sacrifice are recorded in 228 (the first example), 216 and 114/113 (the only examples the ancient sources record), and Pliny must be referring to one of these occasions, rather than to some event in his own day. Subsequently, as Pliny himself informs us, in 97, in the consulship of P.Licinius Crassus and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus, a decree of the Senate was passed forbidding human sacrifice, which had been practised down to that time. It was probably as a result of this decree that the Bletonesii, a tribe in Further Spain, were given a warning when they sacrificed a man to their gods. Presumably this incident took place shortly after 97. It is described by Plutarch, who expresses surprise at the attitude of the Romans, for they had themselves "not many years before" (in 114/113 ?) buried alive 2 men and 2 women (2 Greeks and 2 Gauls) in the Forum Boarium. The story seems confirmed by the fact that the governor of Further Spain in the period 96-93 was P.Licinius Crassus, the man who was consul in 97 when the decree of the Senate had been passed, forbidding further human sacrifice. Pliny's information on human sacrifice is therefore quite credible, and in telling of the burial of the 2 Greeks and 2 Gauls he may be referring to the same event as

Plutarch: in other words the affair of 114/113.

(53) 10.16: In his second consulship Gaius Marius assigned to the Roman legions the eagle as their special badge. Even previously, it had been their first badge, with four others (wolves, minotaurs, horses, and boars) going in front of the respective ranks; but, a few years before, the custom had come in of carrying the eagles alone into action, the rest being left behind in camp. Marius discarded them altogether.

The date of Marius' second consulship is 104. Festus and Vegetius confirm what Pliny says about the minotaur and the boar, Festus adding that there were originally five military signa with the boar taking (as in Pliny) fifth place. Sallust seems to hint that Marius was responsible for the re-ordering of the signa. The importance attached by Marius to eagles is well known. It looks, therefore, as if Pliny is right in ascribing this innovation to Marius' military reforms. When the five pre-Marian legionary standards were superseded by the single aquila, the word signum was applied to the manipular standards in distinction from the legionary aquila. Under the Empire, however, the custom arose of adding, in addition to the eagle, different animals to the legionary standards (the first example, in fact, being that of the elephant that was awarded by Julius Caesar to the Fifth Legion for service in Africa against the Pompeians); interestingly enough, among the various animals thus added there does not appear the wolf, horse, or minotaur. Pliny's information here, then, seems credible.

(54) 22.II: The only centurion to receive the corona graminea up to the present time was Cn. Petreius of Atina. Serving as chief centurion under Catulus, he harangued his legion when it was cut off by the enemy, killed his own tribune when he hesitated to break through the enemy camp, and brought

the legion out. The sources record that, in addition to this honour, the same man, with the consuls Marius and Catulus at his side, offered sacrifice on a brazier placed for the purpose, wearing the magisterial gown (the prae-texta), and to the music of the piper.

Marius and Catulus were consuls in 102; Petreius served with Catulus in the latter's war against the Cimbri in 101. Pliny's account suggests that Petreius was more remarkable than even the best chief centurions, not only because of his participation in the sacrifice with the two consuls but also because of his winning the corona graminea, since, normally, centurions were not eligible for this highest of all Roman military decorations.<sup>222</sup> We know absolutely nothing of this man apart from what Pliny tells us. There seems no reason to doubt the trustworthiness of the item.

(55) 3.I38 (cf. 33.78; 37.202): An old senatus consultum prohibited mining in Italy.

This senatorial decree is usually thought to belong to the second century, but its exact date is unknown. Nor do we know for how long this ban on mining in Italy lasted. The iron of Elba at least was certainly being exploited in Augustus' day.<sup>223</sup> Pliny also does not spell out the senate's reason for restricting the mining of metals like gold, silver and copper, though he implies it was to prevent supplies of them from becoming exhausted. But there is no reason to doubt the senate did pass such a decree. Its action is somewhat reminiscent of Porsenna's insertion of a clause into his treaty with Rome after the expulsion of the Kings, forbidding the use of iron in Latium except for agricultural implements.<sup>224</sup>

(56) 35.II5: M.Plautius, who had been born in Asia, was granted the citizenship of the town of Ardea, where he had painted the temple.

When this happened it is impossible to say. But it must have been some time between 133 (when Asia became a Roman province) and 90 (when Ardea became Roman),<sup>225</sup> unless it is Ardea's later Roman citizenship that is meant. Plautius might have been a Levantine slave, manumitted at Ardea after 90. There is no reason to doubt this item, which is interesting for the light that it may throw on Italy of the second century BC.

(57) 19.40: Thirty pounds of silphium were imported into Rome by the state in the consulship of Gaius Valerius and Marcus Herennius,<sup>226</sup> and at the beginning of the Civil War<sup>227</sup> Julius Caesar produced out of the aerarium, together with gold and silver, 1500 pounds of silphium.

The date of the consulship of Valerius and Herennius was 93, that of the beginning of the Civil War 49. Pliny states the above information very positively. Possibly this guarantees its accuracy.

(58) 28.148; 33.20: Drusus, when tribune of the plebs, was said to have drunk goat's blood, because he wished, by his pallor, to accuse his enemy Caepio of having poisoned him, and so to arouse hatred against him. Again, the original reason for the bad feeling between the former friends Drusus and Caepio was a ring that had been put up for auction.<sup>228</sup>

The date is 91, and what Pliny says is credible. Pliny tells us elsewhere<sup>229</sup> that Drusus suffered from epilepsy and had taken the cure for it at the town of Anticyra (though at what date Pliny does not say - obviously, however, not in 91, in which year he died).<sup>230</sup> The Auctor de viris illustribus, for his part, says that Livius Drusus, wishing to put off granting the demands of the Latins for citizenship that had been promised them, suddenly fell down in public and was carried home half-dead, his collapse being caused "sive morbo comitiali, seu h~~ab~~sto caprino sanguine." Some of Drusus' enemies suspected that his sudden fit was feigned in an effort to discredit Quintus

Caepio. Whether genuine or not, the epileptic fit would be grounds for adjourning a meeting of the comitia (for that reason it was called the morbus comitialis) and would be seen as a political move on the part of Drusus. <sup>231</sup>

Whether Drusus and Caepio really did fall out over the sale of a ring cannot be determined. Pliny adds that the quarrel between the men was the primary cause of the war with the allies and of the disasters that sprang from it.

These two references in Pliny seem to be part and parcel of the common tradition which put the blame for the Social War on Drusus <sup>232</sup> and the Optimate quarreling. <sup>233</sup>

(59) 22.12: Sulla claimed in writing to have received the corona graminea from his army at Nola in the Marsic War because of his defeat of the Samnites, <sup>234</sup> and then had had the scene painted on his Tusculan villa (which subsequently became the property of Cicero).

The incident at Nola occurred in 89. Pliny seems to doubt the truth of Sulla's claim ("quod si verum est"), which no doubt came originally from Sulla's own Memoirs. If Sulla's claim, however, be true, then in view of the conditions governing the award of the corona graminea <sup>235</sup> Sulla must have experienced serious difficulties at Nola (at which, indeed, the ancient sources <sup>236</sup> hint, although they reveal nothing corresponding to the conditions necessary for the award of the corona), or possibly Sulla managed to persuade his army that the situation had been grave enough for him to deserve the corona. It may be, however, that Sulla's claim was an outright falsehood. Claims made in Roman autobiographies, especially Sulla's, are bound to be suspect. What seems likely is that Sulla did not win a victory against heavy odds at Nola in 89, so that Pliny's scepticism seems justified. But we need not doubt that Pliny reports accurately what Sulla wrote.

(60) 3.70: The town of Stabiae existed until Sulla destroyed it, on



the day before the Kalends of May in the consulship of Gnaeus Pompeius and Lucius Cato.

The date is thus 29 April, 89. The careful pinpointing of the date makes it almost certain that this item is reliable, even though no other author mentions the obliteration of Stabiae in the Social War. It is true that Sulla preferred not to destroy Pompeii after he had reduced it by siege at about this time, but that may have been because he already had some idea that Pompeii might prove useful as a place in which to settle veterans after hostilities were over (he certainly put the place to that use after the Civil War).<sup>237</sup> Stabiae, on the other hand, was not very suitable for a colony; and, once it had been taken into the insurgents' camp by C.Papius in 90,<sup>238</sup> Sulla may have felt that there was no further reason to spare it.

(61) 7.I35: Publius Ventidius won a triumph from the Parthians, and in his boyhood he was led captive in Gnaeus Pompeius' triumph after Asculum, although Masurius states that he was led in triumph twice.

Pliny is evidently correcting Masurius, whom, however, he may have misinterpreted. Masurius, in fact, may have meant the same thing as Pliny, namely, that Ventidius participated in two triumphs: in one as a captive under Pompeius Strabo in 89,<sup>239</sup> in the other as a victor over the Parthians in 38. The ancient evidence indicates clearly that this was what happened to Ventidius.<sup>240</sup> Thus Valerius Maximus says that Pompeius Strabo triumphed when Ventidius was very young;<sup>241</sup> Aulus Gellius states that Pompeius Strabo led Ventidius' mother in his triumph and that she carried her son in her arms;<sup>242</sup> whereas Dio reports that Ventidius fought against the Romans during the Social War and was captured and led by Pompeius Strabo in chains in his triumph.<sup>243</sup> Pliny's statement that Ventidius was a puer when he was led captive

might agree with any of these statements: puer can mean a baby in arms, or a boy, or even a youth of 16.

(62) I3.24: When P.Licinius Crassus and L.Julius Caesar were censors<sup>244</sup> they issued an edict forbidding anyone to sell foreign unguents.

This edict, apparently of the year of 89, is alluded to nowhere else. It is of the type of sumptuary legislation that was passed from time to time at Rome.

(63) I4.95: The same censors also issued an edict forbidding anyone to sell Greek or Aminnian wine at more than 8 asses per quadrantale.

This reference, too, may be trustworthy. The censorial legislation of 89 is obviously of the sumptuary sort, and P.Licinius Crassus, at least, was in favour of such. At some time before 89 he may have passed a sumptuary Lex Licinia, possibly ca. 102, since Lucilius, who died at about that time,<sup>245</sup> refers to it.

## Chapter 4

### Pliny on the Period from the Social War to the Death of Augustus

(64) 7.I37: Sulla was the only human being down to the present  
time ("ad hoc aevi") to assume the cognomen "Felix."<sup>246</sup>

This simply is not true, that is, if one interprets "hoc aevi" as meaning Pliny's time. The cognomen had been inherited and used before Pliny's time by such members of the gens as L.Cornelius Sulla Felix, cos.ord.AD33 with Servius Sulpicius Galba. Perhaps, however, Pliny is guilty of careless writing. No doubt he means "down to Sulla's own time,"<sup>247</sup> or more probably, the time of the source that he is here using.

(65) 7.I65: The orator M.Caelius Rufus was born on 28 May in the consulship of Gaius Marius and Gnaeus Carbo (the latter's third), that is, on the same day as the orator C.Licinius Calvus.

The year Pliny refers to is 82. Now we know that Caelius was praetor in 48, and the Lex Annalis stipulated that a man had to be 39 to be praetor. In other words, Caelius must have been born in 87 or earlier (his plebeian tribunate in 52 also suggests the earlier birthdate). Pliny here, then,<sup>248</sup> has erred.

(66) 33.I34: Sulla died the richest man in Rome, richer even than Crassus.

Sulla died in 78. This item seems worthy of credence.<sup>249</sup>

(67) 7.96 (cf. also 3.I8; 37.I5): The trophy which Pompey set up in

the Pyrenees after his victory over the Spanish tribes was inscribed with the statement that Pompey had brought into subjection 876 towns between the Alps and the borders of Further Spain, and, "maiore animo," omitted any reference to Sertorius.<sup>250</sup>

Pompey's trophy in the Pyrenees in 72 is known from other sources,<sup>251</sup> and Pliny's account of the contents of its inscription could well be trustworthy.

(68) 16.7; 7.115: Varro was honoured by Pompey for distinguished service in the Pirate War: Pompey conferred the corona rostrata upon him.<sup>252</sup> In addition, Varro was also honoured by being the only living person to have his statue erected in the library founded at Rome by Asinius Pollio with the spoils resulting from his conquest of the Parthini in Illyria.

The Pirate War was in 67, of course, and Pollio's triumph over the Parthini in 39. Pliny's information about the honours paid to Varro may well be correct. It is true that Livy, Velleius, Seneca and Dio<sup>253</sup> all say that M. Agrippa was the first man to win the corona rostrata, obtaining it from Octavian for his part in the naval war against Sextus Pompey in 36; and Pliny himself records that Agrippa got it on this occasion. But Pliny's assertion that Varro had got it before Agrippa receives some support from Varro's obvious partiality for Pompey: it could be due precisely to his having received this honour at Pompey's hands. Pliny, it is to be noted, is usually alert to the possibility that claims to have won coronae may be<sup>254</sup> bogus. Even though he may have found this one in Varro's own de Vita Sua,<sup>255</sup> he evidently regarded it as genuine.

(69) 6.52: According to Varro Pompey discovered how long it takes for Indian merchandize to reach Asia Minor by way of the Caspian. He learned all about it during his well-known expedition against the Albani in the

Caspian Sea region.

We have no means of knowing whether this apparently superfluous campaign of 65 (which seems to anticipate a similar one in the reign of the Emperor Nero) was due to Pompey's desire to gain the glory of a triumph over peoples whose very names were new to the Romans or whether he was seeking to develop a trans-Caspian trade-route to the further East. <sup>256</sup> But the campaign did take place; hence, Pliny's report of what Pompey found out may well be true. He himself tells us that he got it from Varro, and Varro is normally a good authority, even if he did lapse into error on occasion.

(70) 7.45-6: M. Agrippa died in his fiftieth year.

The date was 12 BC, so that Agrippa must have been born in 64/63, <sup>257</sup> "feet first," so Pliny says. This is our only precise evidence for the date of Agrippa's birth: it is consonant with what is otherwise known about Agrippa's life and career.

(71) 37.16: After his victories in the East, Pompey gave 6000 sesterces to each of his soldiers, 100,000,000 sesterces to the legati and quaestors who had guarded the coasts, and 200,000,000 sesterces to the aerarium.

The date, according to Appian and Plutarch, is the winter of 62. The figures given by Pliny receive some support ~~from~~ other sources. The figure of 6000 sesterces (1500 drachmae) for each soldier is confirmed by Plutarch and Appian. <sup>258</sup> But Appian gives the total distributed to soldiers and officers together as 16,000 talents (=384,000,000 sesterces: if the legati got 100,000,000 the soldiers and other officers got 284,000,000. If each man got 6000, this gives what seems like the impossibly large amount of 47,000 for the officers. This figure can be reduced if we assume that

there were officers besides the legati and that they got more than 6000 sesterces each). Plutarch, on the other hand, says that the tituli carried at Pompey's triumph in 61 (for which, see Reference 72) claimed that he was bringing 20,000 talents into the aerarium (=480,000,000 sesterces). As both Pliny and Plutarch claim to be quoting from official sources, Pliny from the records of Pompey's triumph (37.13 "verba ex ipsis Pompei triumphorum actis subiciam"), and Plutarch from the tituli of the triumphal procession, the difference in their figures for the amount given into the aerarium is at first sight surprising. However, since Pliny's total for the men at 6000 sesterces each is not given, and since Plutarch's figure of 480,000,000 might be the total of Appian's 384,000,000 plus Pliny's 100,000,000, it may be possible to reconcile the apparently disparate figures:

	<u>Totals</u>
Pliny a) 100,000,000 to <u>legati</u>	
b) 200,000,000 to <u>aerarium</u>	
c) 180,000,000 to 30,000 men (at 6000 each), assuming an army of 30,000 men	480,000,000
Plutarch (who regards it all as going to the treasury)	480,000,000
Appian (who totalled Pliny's b) and c) when he should have totalled Pliny's a) and c) )	380,000,000

A total of 480,000,000 sesterces does not seem improbable when we remember Aemilius Paulus' loot, which was smaller than Pompey's. Paulus' victory over King Perseus of Macedon netted 120,000,000 sesterces, plus wagons, plus

gold and silver for the triumphal procession (according to Valerius Antias<sup>261</sup> via Livy), and a total payment of 300,000,000 sesterces for the aerarium<sup>262</sup> (according to Pliny). Pliny, then, is probably trustworthy in this item.

(72) 7.97-8 (cf. 37.16): Pompey celebrated a triumph on 28, 29<sup>263</sup> September in the consulship of M.Piso and M.Messala after his return from the East.

The date is 61, and Pompey's triumph was unusually magnificent and<sup>264</sup> needed two days. It is described much more fully by Plutarch,<sup>265</sup> Appian<sup>266</sup> and others, but Pliny gives a number of details not found anywhere else. Pliny alone tells us the exact date of the triumph. He is likewise alone in telling us that the second of the two days it took was also Pompey's birthday,<sup>267</sup> which would otherwise be unknown to us. It is Pliny, too, who gives us the praefatio of Pompey's triumph, listing his exploits in the East and the peoples over whom he triumphed, information that we would otherwise lack, owing to a lacuna in the Acta Triumphalia Capitolina ad ann.61. And, besides the praefatio, Pliny also reproduces Pompey's summary account (breviarium)<sup>268</sup> of his own exploits: this was set up in the shrine of Minerva dedicated by Pompey out of his spoils. And here, too, Pliny may be supplying information<sup>269</sup> otherwise unknown. Diodorus, it is true, also records what he calls the ἀντίγραφον of a dedication which Pompey set up in tablet form to record his achievements in Asia; but although this looks like the breviarium which, according to Pliny, Pompey set up in the shrine of Minerva, it probably is not. For Diodorus includes details which Pliny assigns not<sup>to</sup> the breviarium in Minerva's shrine but to the praefatio of Pompey's triumph. Yet Diodorus' ἀντίγραφον was not identical with Pompey's praefatio either, since it omits details that the praefatio includes, such as the number of ships, prisoners

and towns taken by Pompey. These discrepancies disappear if we conjecture that the praefatio, as well as the breviarium, was set up in Minerva's shrine and that Diodorus conflated the two but omitted to reproduce them in full (he does not even list Mithridates as one of the kings conquered by Pompey). It is also to be noted that Pliny (and only Pliny) includes Crete among Pompey's conquests. In fact, it was Metellus Creticus who subdued Crete, 'triumphing' for it in 62.<sup>270</sup> But both Velleius Paterculus and Florus<sup>271</sup> record that Pompey claimed that Metellus was serving under him, Pompey, at the time, so that in effect the triumph virtually belonged to him.<sup>272</sup> Another interesting detail about Pompey's triumph that is given in Pliny, and nowhere else, is Pompey's claim, for what it is worth, to have slain or received the surrender of 12,183,000 people in the East. Pliny's information about Pompey's triumph can be accepted with caution: it seems to be based on Pompey's own claims, and Pompey, like the Emperor Augustus in the Res Gestae, was not above giving a tendentious version of his exploits.

(73) 36.104: Milo had contracted debts to the amount of 70 million sesterces, a total verging on the incredible: "inter prodigia animi humani."

It is, in fact, not easy to find record of any other debt as large as Pliny says Milo's was. Even Julius Caesar, before he entered upon any public office, had not run up a debt of these dimensions: according to Plutarch,<sup>273</sup> he owed 1300 talents, in other words 31 million sesterces. Milo's debts were evidently both heavy and notorious. In 53 he was a candidate for the consulship and incurred huge expenses. Clodius belaboured Milo in the Senate with his insolvency. Milo himself, according to the Scholia<sup>274</sup> Bobiensia, had admitted to a debt of "sestertium sexagies," that is, six million sesterces,<sup>275</sup> and it is significant that Cicero delivered a speech



de aere alieno Milonis (Cicero, of course, regarded Milo's election as of the utmost importance for himself, and would not have advertised his insolvency had it not been unavoidable). Hence Pliny's astronomical figure may be right.

(74) 34.I39: At the time of the disorders resulting from the death of Clodius, Pompey, consul for the third time, issued an edict forbidding the possession of any weapon inside the city.

Nothing seems more probable than that some such edict as this was issued in 52. It was probably not part of the Lex Pompeia de vi of 52 (which was a privilegium directed against Milo) but rather fell under the old Lex Plautia de vi (ca. 78-63).<sup>276</sup>

(75) 36.II6: Aemilius Scaurus' father had been a receiver of the goods that Marius and his associates had plundered from the provinces, and his mother (Caecilia Metella) had bought up the property of those proscribed by Sulla (her second husband).<sup>277</sup>

Even if this identification of a source for Scaurus' wealth is true (and there is no reason to doubt it), it, nevertheless, does not tell the whole story, for we know that Scaurus made immense sums from his military adventures in 64-59, under Pompey, in Judaea, Syria and Arabia Petraea, and these enabled him to give his fabulous display as aedile in 58 in Rome.

(76) 26.I9: Caesar's soldiers felt hunger at Pharsalia.

No other source mentions this. However, Caesar,<sup>278</sup> Suetonius,<sup>279</sup> Appian,<sup>280</sup> Dio,<sup>281</sup> and Pliny<sup>282</sup> himself all refer to hunger suffered by Caesar's men at the ~~sa~~ige of Dyrrachium in 48. It seems reasonable to conclude that Pliny<sup>283</sup> has been guilty of a serious slip of memory here.

(77) 2.I47: When M.Crassus was killed by the Parthians, all the

Lucanian soldiers, of whom there was a large number in his army, perished with him. Pliny implies that the disaster was presaged when it rained iron in Lucania the year before.

The year of Crassus' death was 53. It may well be true that Crassus' force contained a large, but otherwise unrecorded, Lucanian contingent, and it may even be possible to account for its presence. Crassus is known to have had trouble recruiting soldiers for his expedition. He seems to have gone through the south of Italy picking up whatever soldiers he could (Horace names Marsians and Apulians as serving in his army)<sup>284</sup>. Now Crassus seems to have had some connection with Lucania. He had an old score to pay off at the Lucanians' expense, since in 90 their troops under M.Lamponius had defeated his father P.Licinius Crassus during the Social War.<sup>285</sup> M.Crassus got his revenge at the Colline Gate when he commanded the right wing and saved the day for Sulla by defeating the Lucanians under the same M.Lamponius and the Samnites under Pontius Telesinus.<sup>286</sup> It is possible that after the victory he was one of those to profit from Sulla's distribution of the land of enemies in Lucania and Samnium. He was active again in Lucania against Spartacus in 71.<sup>287</sup> One way or another, then, Crassus may have built up a clientela in Lucania; and this could account for there being many Lucanians with him at Carrhae.

(78) 7.92: Caesar fought 50 pitched battles, and he alone beat the record of M.Marcellus who fought 39.<sup>288</sup>

This item should be dated to 44BC, the year of Caesar's assassination. Pliny may well be right here; at any rate, the other feat which he mentions, that Caesar killed in his battles 1,192,000 men, is confirmed by Plutarch,<sup>289</sup> who gives the round figure of 1 million.

(79) 7.I34: The senator M.Fidustius, who survived for 36 years after his proscription by Sulla, was proscribed by Antony, and for no other reason than that he had been proscribed before.

290

The story is confirmed by Dio. Pliny's 36 years, however, can hardly be right, since Sulla's proscription belongs to 82-81 and Antony's to 43-42. Hence Pliny is here guilty of some carelessness.

(80) 34.6: The notorious Verres perished when proscribed by Antony.

291

292

The date is 43. Seneca and Lactantius say the same thing, but Pliny alone tells us why Verres had aroused Antony's ire: he had refused to surrender to Antony some Corinthian bronzes. It is in character for Verres and is probably trustworthy.

293

294

(81) 37.8I: The senator Nonius was proscribed by the triumvirs for his possessions: Antony coveted a particularly valuable gem which he possessed.

There is no reason to regard this item as untrustworthy.

(82) 7.I36: Cornelius Balbus the Elder was the first non-Italian to reach the consulship at Rome.

Balbus was from Gades in Hispania Ulterior and his achievement (it occurred in 40) has become famous: no other non-Italian became consul until Valerius Asiaticus of Narbonensis achieved the office three quarters of a century later. Yet we would be entirely ignorant of Balbus' feat were it not for Pliny. Perhaps his service in Spain accounts for Pliny's evident interest in Balbus: elsewhere he records that this man's nephew, Balbus the Younger (who had been granted Roman citizenship along with his uncle in 72), was the only non-Italian ever to be granted the honour of celebrating a Roman triumph (in 19). This, too, is an item of information found only in Pliny.

296

(83) I5.I36-37: A portent befell Livia Drusilla (who later received the name of Augusta on her marriage) after she had been betrothed to Octavian. It occurred at Ad Gallinas nine miles north of Rome: an eagle dropped upon her a white hen bearing a laurel branch in its beak.

This happened in 39, and the story is famous, being found also in Suetonius<sup>297</sup> and Cassius Dio,<sup>298</sup> whose versions, however, differ to a certain extent from Pliny's.<sup>299</sup> The portent was always regarded as referring not so much to Livia as to Octavian, and was interpreted as foretelling his rise to greatness as Augustus.<sup>300</sup> It should be noted Livia was not styled Augusta on her marriage to Octavian, pace Pliny; rather she got the title after Augustus' death in AD 14.<sup>301</sup> Moreover, Ad Gallinas, the modern Prima Porta, is not 9 miles from Rome but 7. Thus Pliny (at least in these respects) is both careless and inaccurate.

(84) 7.178-79: A certain Gabienus, the bravest man in Octavian's navy, was captured and had his throat cut by Sextus Pompey; but, so it is alleged, before dying, he urged that Pompey should come to him, or send one of his personal staff, as he had come back from the lower world and had some news to tell him. Pompey sent several of his friends, who were told by Gabienus that the gods below approved Pompey's cause and the righteous party ("Pompei causas et partes pias"), so that the issue would be what Pompey desired.

This incident presumably occurred in the naval war of 36. Pliny refuses to believe the story about Gabienus, even though he has just re-counted,<sup>302</sup> on Varro's authority, and without any discernible doubt as to its credibility, another story of an apparently dead person recovering. Yet the tale about Gabienus must have achieved some notoriety (Pliny himself

calls it an "ingens exemplum"), for it was picked up and adapted by Lucan: 303  
 in his pages Sextus Pompey consults in Thessaly the witch Erichtho about  
 the outcome of the impending battle of Pharsalus (in 48); Erichtho, by magic  
 devices, resurrects a dead soldier, who proceeds to say that, while the  
 fates favour the Pompeians, nevertheless, they will deny them victory at  
 Pharsalus, but that a safe place will be reserved for Pompey the Great and  
 his family in the brighter part of the Infernal Kingdom. Pliny's story is  
 probably part of pro-Pompeian propaganda circulating prior to the defeat of  
 Sextus at Nauloch<sup>u</sup>s on 3 September 36. It is interesting to note that, in  
 Pliny's version, it is a follower of Octavian who brings the news to Sextus,  
 but in Lucan's it is that of a dead, possibly Pompeian, soldier. 304

(85) 7.I48: Octavian, in the naval rout when a detachment of the 305  
 enemy was already pressing close at hand, asked his friend Gaius Proculeius  
 to kill him.

This incident occurred in the naval war off Sicily against Sextus 306  
 Pompey in 36, and there seems no reason to doubt the credibility of Pliny's  
 information.

(86) 36.I2I: In his aedileship M. Agrippa constructed the Aqua Virgo. 307  
 Agrippa's surprising aedileship belongs to 33, but he built the 308  
 Aqua Virgo not then, but in 19. It seems likely that Pliny's error ori-  
 ginated in Agrippa's commemoratio of his aedileship, since Frontinus, who 309  
 used the Commentarii of Agrippa, got the date right. 310 Otherwise, Pliny's  
 error may simply be due to his carelessly attributing all of Agrippa's work 311  
 on aqueducts to the famous year of his aedileship.

(87) 2I.I2: During the preparations for the war which culminated at  
 Actium, Antony was suspicious even of Cleopatra herself, going so far in fact

as to refuse food that had not been foretasted; but Cleopatra cleared herself by demonstrating to Antony how she could have easily killed him with a poisoned chaplet.

312

The date is 32/31. Plutarch reports the anxiety felt by Cleopatra that Antony might abandon her and return to Octavia. Even so, Pliny's tale seems very far-fetched.

(88) 22.13: In the consulship of Cicero's son Marcus Augustus was presented, on 13 September, with the corona obsidionalis by the Senate: so inadequate was the corona civica thought to be.

The date of young Cicero's consulship was 30BC. The corona obsidionalis was also called the corona graminea (under different circumstances)<sup>313</sup>.

Only Pliny reports the grant of this crown to Augustus (though Dio may hint<sup>314</sup> at it). It is strange that it is not mentioned, along with the awarding<sup>315</sup> of the corona civica, in Augustus' Res Gestae. At any rate, Pliny's precision in the dating of the award may be a guarantee of the item's credibility.<sup>316</sup>

317

(89) 35.8: A speech by the orator Messala is extant protesting against the insertion among the likenesses of his family of a bust not belonging to them but to the family of the Laevini.<sup>318</sup> Further, a similar reason extracted from Messala the Elder<sup>319</sup> the volumes he composed "On Families" because, when passing through the atrium of Scipio Pomponianus, he had<sup>320</sup> observed the Salvittones (Salvitto was their former cognomen): it arose from an act of adoption by will, whereby the Salvittones infringed upon others' preserves, to the discredit of the Scipios with the surname Africanus.

The falsification of Roman history through bragging family records is well known from Cicero and Livy.<sup>321</sup> Pliny seems to find nothing wrong with

it in this passage.

(90) 34.22: A pleb<sup>e</sup>ian aedile, Sextus Pacuvius Taurus, restored one of the three statues of Sibyl standing near the Rostra.

There is no way of knowing whether Pliny is trustworthy here. Sextus Pacuvius may be the same man as the tr.plebis of 27 at a different stage of his career. In 27 the old Republican custom, that permitted the same man to serve at different times as both tr.plebis and pleb<sup>e</sup>ian aedile, still obtained.<sup>322</sup> On the other hand Pacuvius Taurus may be the tr.plebis of 8BC. By that date, it is true, the old Republican custom had died out and a man normally did not serve in both offices; Augustus, however, faced with growing reluctance on the part of suitable men to serve as aedile, would sometimes select ex-<sup>323</sup> quaestors and ex-tribunes by lot and oblige them to take the office.

(91) 7.149: Augustus at one time suspected the designs of Marcellus.

The occasion is unknown. We know of the rivalry between Marcellus and Agrippa and between Marcellus and Tiberius,<sup>324</sup> but there is no other direct evidence of tension between Augustus and Marcellus. Pliny may be referring to disappointed hopes on the part of Marcellus in 23 when Augustus fell ill, seemed unlikely to recover, and yet failed to name a successor: although he did give Calpurnius Piso a list of the armed forces and of the public revenues written in a book and did entrust his ring to Agrippa.<sup>325</sup> All of this would be very disappointing to Marcellus, if he had had hopes of being actually named for the succession. Pliny's information here may or may not be trustworthy, but there must have been many rumours current at this period of Augustus' life and Pliny is doubtless reporting one of them.

(92) 6.160-62: The towns and peoples through which Aelius Gallus marched during his well known expedition into Arabia are described.

The date is 25-4. Pliny lists those towns destroyed by Gallus,<sup>326</sup> but not named by other writers, and notes that the furthest point of penetration reached by Gallus was the town of Caripeta,<sup>327</sup> after he had destroyed, among other places, Mariba. Pliny took the information from Gallus' own report. This, of course, is no absolute guarantee of its correctness, but if it were not for Pliny we would certainly know little about the expedition.

(93) 5.36-7: When L.Cornelius Balbus the Elder, of Gades, was granted Roman citizenship, his nephew L.Cornelius Balbus Minor was also granted the citizenship. The younger Balbus, as proconsul, defeated the Garamantes and celebrated a triumph, being the only non-Italian ever to do so; the places he captured are listed.

The Roman citizenship was conferred on Balbus and his uncle in 72 by a law sponsored by one of Pompey's legates in Spain.<sup>328</sup> The triumph of the Younger Balbus belongs to 19, as we know from elsewhere, but only Pliny gives the details of the places captured, no doubt deriving them ultimately, as he himself implies, from the Acta Triumphalia. The information here, as in the case of Aelius Gallus in Reference 92, is valuable since otherwise we know little of Balbus' campaign.

(94) 18.37: L.Tarius Rufus,<sup>329</sup> though of extremely humble birth, won a consulship by his soldierly efficiency; though in other respects a man of old-fashioned thrift, he spent the whole of the money that he had accumulated through the generosity of Augustus, about 10 million sesterces,<sup>330</sup> in buying up farms in Picenum<sup>331</sup> and farming them, with the purpose of making a name for himself; the result was that his heir refused to take over the estate.

Like Agrippa, Statilius Taurus and Sulpicius Quirinius, Tarius Rufus,



the novus homo, was a man of obscure birth but of military ability, which Augustus was quick to recognise and use. Hence, because of the military services he rendered (at Actium for instance) he was made suffect consul in 16. There is no reason to doubt Pliny's information on Tarius Rufus.

(95) II.55: Although augurs invariably interpreted the alighting of bees as a bad omen, there were occasions when this was not the case; for example, they alighted in the camp of the Commander Drusus on the occasion of his great victory at Arbalo.

Arbalo is otherwise unknown, but, evidently, it was the scene of some success by Nero Claudius Drusus (brother of Tiberius) in his campaign beyond the Rhine in 12-11. The reliability of this item may be called into question.

(96) 33.I35-36: C.Caecilius C.l.Isidorus affords an example of a very wealthy libertus. On 27 January, in the consulship of C.Asinius Gallus and C.Marcus Censorinus, Isidorus executed a will, in which he declared that in spite of heavy losses in the Civil War he nevertheless left 4116 slaves, 3600 pairs of oxen, 257,000 head of other cattle, and 60 million sesterces in cash, and he gave instructions for 1,100,000 to be spent on his funeral.

The date is 8BC. Obviously Isidorus had acquired most of his wealth before imperial times. He probably inherited it from a childless patron, one of the Caecilii Metelli perhaps. The exactness with which Pliny quotes the date of Isidorus' will argues for the trustworthiness of this item.

(97) 34.II-12: A woman named Gegania obtained Clesippus, a hunchback fuller, at an auction sale (he was thrown into the bargain when she bought a Corinthian candelabrum), the whole lot going for 50,000 sesterces. This woman gave a party to show off her purchases, and, for the mockery of the guests, the man appeared with no clothes on; his mistress, conceiving an outrageous passion for him, admitted him to her bed and later gave him a

place in her will. Thus becoming excessively rich, he worshipped the lampstand in question as a divinity and so caused this story to be attached to Corinthian lampstands in general, though the claims of morality were vindicated by his erecting a noble tombstone to perpetuate throughout the world for all time the memory of Gegania's shame.

As Pliny tells it, the story sounds wildly improbable, yet the existence of an inscription on a gravestone seems to vindicate it. The stone is broken, but its inscription is still legible: "Clesipus Geganius/mag.  
336  
Capi[t]., mag.luperc.,viat.tr." The inscription may be dated to the last  
337  
years of the Republic, or perhaps even later.

(98) 3.I36-37: Augustus set up a Tropaeum near Monaco commemorating the subjugation of the Alpine peoples with the following inscription: "Imp. Caesari divi filio Aug.pont.max.,imp.XIV,tr.pot.XVII,SPQR,quod eius ductu auspiciisque gentes Alpinae omnes quae a mar*i* supero ad inferum pertinebant sub imperium p.R.sunt redactae." There follows a list of 46 peoples.

The pacification of the Alpine tribes was achieved by a series of  
338  
campaigns from 25 to 7/6. The monument, erected in 7-6, still stands at La Turbie (i.e. Tropaea) near Monaco, but of its inscription only fragments remain. These seem to confirm the general accuracy of Pliny's list, which is now regularly accepted as the equivalent of epigraphic evidence (it is  
339  
printed in CIL, for instance, and Ehrenberg and Jones).<sup>340</sup> The inscription, thus fortunately quoted by Pliny, by recording both the fact and its date (imp.XIV,tr.pot.XVII), is important evidence for the Alpine campaigns, even though in some of its details it is demonstrably faulty (see below, Chapter 5). It can be compared with Augustus' own statement in the Res Gestae: "Alpes a regione ea quae proxima est Hadriano mari ad Tuscum

341

pacificavi nulli genti bello per iniuriam inlato." Cisalpine Gaul, whose union with peninsular Italy in 42 does not seem to have been maintained without interruption, thus became in the fullest sense a part of Italy.

There is a further reason for the importance of this item. The tropaeum is not a mere commemorative monument, but is rather a sanctuary consecrated to the Genius Augusti. Hitherto such tropaea had been consecrated to a god by the victorious general. This is the first known instance of such a monument being dedicated to a man, in this case by the Senate and the Roman people.<sup>342</sup>

(99) 3.I38: The states listed on the inscription of the Tropaeum Augusti do not include those 15 civitates that had not shown hostility and which were "adtributae municipiis lege Pompeia."

343

By the Lex Pompeia of 89 the ius Latii was given to all the towns in the Transpadane region which had not been made municipia by the Lex Julia of the previous year, so that Pliny's statement means that various, presumably smaller, civitates or urban tribes in Transpadane Gaul were "attributed" by the Lex Pompeia to the newly created municipia of 90.<sup>344</sup>

This is an important contribution to our knowledge of the way Roman citizenship was extended, even if the names given by Pliny are not in every instance trustworthy (see below, Chapter 5).

(100) 7.60: The acta of the period of the Emperor Augustus record that on 9 April in his twelfth consulship, when L.Sulla was his colleague, a plebeian of free birth from Faesulae named C. Crispinius Hilarus went in procession to sacrifice on the Capitol, preceded by 8 children (including two daughters), 27 grandchildren, 18 great-grandchildren, and 8 granddaughters by marriage.<sup>345</sup>

The date is 5BC. The precision with which Pliny describes the incident would seem to guarantee its accuracy. It is important evidence for Augustus' policy of "italianization."

(101) 7.I49: Augustus' daughter Julia engaged in a conspiracy against her father's life.

346

Evidence for such a conspiracy can be found also in Seneca and Dio. <sup>347</sup> We know that Augustus banished Julia in 2BC to the island of Pandateria on a charge of having committed adultery with numerous Romans of every class. Augustus severely punished the more prominent among her lovers, the most eminent being Iullus Antonius, second son of the triumvir, who was condemned to death for his adultery with Julia and (according to Seneca and Dio) for his designs on the supreme power. Antonius forestalled his punishment by committing suicide. According to the official version, as represented in a communication by Augustus to the Senate, the sole ground of the legal proceedings was Julia's adultery, and this is the version found in most of the ancient sources. Modern scholars, however, have often suggested that more than adultery was involved, and Pliny here gives them explicit support. Evidently Julia and Antonius (and perhaps others) had engaged in a conspiracy against Augustus. Although the official version plays up the charge of adultery, the penalties imposed certainly exceeded those demanded by the Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis, and, be it noted, they were imposed on Augustus' own daughter (who was the mother of the young heirs to the throne, Lucius and Gaius Caesar) and also on several members of old and prominent families (such as Appius Claudius and Sempronius Gracchus). Clearly, Pliny preserves for us here a valuable item from a tradition, which, <sup>348</sup> but for him, would have been virtually lost.

(102) 2.168; 6.141,160; 12.55; 32.10: Augustus' grandson Gaius Caesar, sent to the East to take command against the Parthians and Arabians, undertook some operations in the vicinity of the Red Sea, <sup>349</sup> where what he thought to be the wrecks of ships from Spain were visible. <sup>350</sup> Gaius, however, only got a glimpse of Arabia, so that Aelius Gallus remained the only person who had carried Rome's arms into that country.

Even though Pliny may be intending to contrast Gaius' achievement in 1BC unfavourably with that of Aelius Gallus in 24, there is no reason to reject this information. He seems to have got it from the books about Arabia which King Juba dedicated to Gaius Caesar himself, and also from the account which Augustus commissioned Dionysius of Charax to write. Gaius' abortive move against Arabia may have been an attempt to revive Augustus' earlier <sup>351</sup> one.

(103) 34.3: C.Sallustius Crispus owned a copper mine among the Ceutrones in the Alps.

Sallustius Crispus was the friend of Augustus and grandnephew and adoptive son of Sallust the historian, but Pliny does not say precisely when he owned the mine. Horace, in a poem usually thought to have been published in 23, may refer to the mine. <sup>352</sup> Whatever the date, the mine was not of long duration, perhaps because it was soon worked out. <sup>353</sup> Pliny here also mentions otherwise unknown mines belonging to Livia and (Sextus) Marius. <sup>354</sup> The wealth of Gaius Sallustius, Livia and Sextus Marius is recorded elsewhere, so that Pliny's information here should be accepted as trustworthy. Sallustius Crispus died in AD 20, Livia in AD 29, and Sextus Marius in AD 33.

(104) 34.58: The Apollo of Myron, which had been taken from the people of Ephesus by Antony, was restored to them by Augustus, in obedience

355

to a warning given him in a dream.

This incident, though not perhaps of great historical importance, may add to the well-known evidence that Octavian had a special fondness for Apollo. In Res Gestae Augustus boasts that he had restored to the temples of Asia Minor the riches which had been plundered from them by his late adversary, so that the item looks trustworthy. The date may be AD but it is impossible to be certain.

(105) 9.II8: M.Lollius disgraced himself by taking gifts from the kings in the East; he was thence excluded from Gaius Caesar's list of friends; and he ultimately drank poison.

Pliny here is talking about Tiberius' bitter enemy, M.Lollius, whom Augustus had chosen in 1BC as counsellor and overseer for Gaius Caesar in the East, and who committed suicide in AD2. Pliny's account seems to reflect a bias against Lollius: the latter had a daughter who was guilty of disgraceful extravagance, an extravagance, moreover, which contrasted with the old-fashioned morality of a Curius or a Fabricius, and she inherited her extravagant ways from her father. The bias is shared by all the ancient sources which deal with the last part of Lollius' life, and no doubt they have contributed something to the notoriety of the clades Lolliana of 17BC (itself part of the unfavourable press). Yet we know that Lollius had at one time been in favour with Augustus, who appointed him to important civil and military offices, culminating in the final assignment, which made Lollius the comes et rector of the young Gaius Caesar in 1BC on his expedition to the East; likewise, Horace, in his fourth book of Odes (the latest poem in which can be dated to 13BC) speaks highly of Lollius. Lollius' end, however, is obscure. Certainly, it resulted from Tiberius' enmity towards

him, which, it is clear, was strong enough to alienate Lollius from the friendship of Gaius Caesar, without, apparently, moving Augustus to defend his old partisan. We can accept Pliny's statement that Gaius renounced his friendship with Lollius. Likewise, that Lollius died suddenly and mysteriously is also sure, but whether he took poison, as Pliny says, is uncertain: even Velleius has no solution, as he admits, to this question. Finally, Pliny's charge that Lollius disgraced himself by taking gifts from the kings in the whole of the East may well be true: he would not have been the first to do so, and Horace's praise of him as "vindex avarae fraudis et abstinentis ducentis ad se cuncta pecuniae" may well protest too much, both in favour of Lollius and, indirectly, of his protector Augustus. From all of this, it would appear that not everything Pliny says about Lollius is to be trusted.

(106) 7.149: Among the blows of fortune suffered by Augustus were the charges about his grandsons' deaths.

This apparently means that rumour had it that the young Caesars were murdered. Whether rumour named Augustus in this connection is not clear from Pliny's Latin. But Pliny is almost certainly referring to the fairly well-known tale that circulated about Livia. There was a tradition that she was suspected of having contrived the deaths of Gaius (AD4) and Lucius (AD2), her obvious motive being her desire to see her own son Tiberius as Augustus' successor. Pliny is right, therefore, in saying that charges were being made; the validity of the charges is, of course, another matter.

(107) 7.33: On the day of Augustus' funeral, a woman from Ostia, by the name of Fausta, was delivered of quadruplets, two male and two female, and this was taken as a portent of the famine that ensued.

As is well known, Augustus died on 19 August AD14, but Pliny alone mentions this famine. The item seems to derive from official records,

which included inter alia such things as portents. The fact of the famine must have been a matter of public record, and Pliny, therefore, is here purveying accurate information.

[A composite Major Reference on Augustus' efforts to promote urbanization.];

(108) 3.6-30; 4.II0-II8: A description is given of the three Spanish provinces Lusitania, Baetica and Hispania Citerior.

Pliny's account derives from Agrippa's survey, which was probably completed about 7<sup>367</sup>BC, and from other official documents, which contained lists of towns with indications of their municipal status (such formulae provin-<sup>368</sup>ciarium were probably published around the turn of the century, 7-2BC?). Pliny reveals which Spanish towns were coloniae and which towns had been granted Latin or Roman rights. Much of his information is found nowhere else, but some of it is confirmed and supplemented by literary and epigraphical sources.<sup>369</sup> On the whole, it looks reliable. Evidently, the Latinisation of Hispania Ulterior was chiefly due to Julius Caesar, and that of Hispania Citerior to Augustus (who, incidently, also divided Ulterior into two provinces, Baetica and Lusitania). The process of Latinisation was to be completed under Vespasian.

3.52: The colonies that were founded in Italy after Actium as part of Augustus' program for settling his veterans are listed by Pliny.

Augustus himself claims to have established 28 such coloniae in Italy,<sup>370</sup> and Pliny (along with some notices in the Libri Coloniarum) here helps us to identify them. "The correspondance between Pliny's lists and the extant inscriptions is, as one would expect, good but not perfect: all the best attested Augustan colonies, the nine known coloniae Iuliae Augustae



and Augustae, appear in his list as colonies, and of the triumviral-Augustan colonies known from other sources (inscriptions referring to coloniae Iuliae and literary evidence) some eighteen or nineteen are registered by him as colonies and between three and seven are not; the cases in which Pliny can be shown to be wrong turn out...to be very few.<sup>371</sup> Pliny then is the indispensable aid for the identification of Augustus' twenty-eight coloniae in Italy, and he is also the locus classicus for an aspect of the Romanization of Italy (which had begun at the beginning of the century with the Lex Julia and the Sullan colonization). From him we learn that most of the Augustan coloniae were in Etruria.<sup>372</sup>

3.46: Augustus' division of Italy into eleven regions.

Pliny is our only source for this information, but he gives us no detailed description of the process or of its background. He merely uses the eleven Augustan regions as a convenient skeleton for his own description of Italy and its cities. He does not, however, take up regions in their numerical order, but starts with the most northerly one and then proceeds counterclockwise round Italy: as he comes to each region, he describes first its coast and then its interior. As a result, he takes the Augustan regions in the following order: 9, 7, 1, 3, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 10. For the inland districts he follows Augustus' arrangement of listing their inhabitants alphabetically according to tribes; when he deals with those living on the coast, he abandons the Emperor's alphabetical lists and turns to another source.<sup>373</sup> The alphabetic lists of individual Italic tribes do not reflect, as has been commonly thought, the regional divisions of Italy made by Augustus but seem rather to be based on the Roman census.<sup>374</sup> They

appear reliable, tallying with the traditional account of the tribal  
 375  
 affiliations of Italic towns. It emerges from Pliny that the boundaries  
 376  
 of the tribes did not always coincide with those of the Augustan regions,  
 and it seems that the alphabetical tribal lists and the eleven regions were  
 not defined at one and the same time. The tribal lists seem to have been  
 377  
 drawn up before 12BC at the latest, whereas the eleven regions may date  
 378  
 from 9BC or even as late as AD6. The regional system was still in exist-  
 ence in AD74, for Pliny cites at 7.164, from the census taken in that year  
 by Vespasian and Titus, numerous cases of longevity, including persons "in  
 regione Italiae octava;" and it continued in a modified form for even longer.  
 More than 500 years after Augustus Italy was still divided along similar  
 lines; and the approximation of these later divisions to the Augustan ones  
 is a further indication that Pliny's information is accurate, even though  
 379  
 it is confirmed by no other author.

(109) 33.29-36: (29) Rings, once the wearing of them became common,  
 served to distinguish the second order from the plebs, just as a tunic dis-  
 tinguished the senate from those who wore the ring, although this distinction,  
 too, came in only quite recently. But the wearing of rings clearly intro-  
 duced a third order, intermediate between the plebs and the senate, and the  
 title that had previously been conferred by the possession of a cavalry  
 horse is now acquired by financial standing. This, however, is a very recent  
 development. (30) When Augustus laid down the regulations for the jury panels  
 (decuriae), most of the jurors belonged to the class that wore the iron ring,  
 and they were called Judges (iudices), not Knights (equites); this latter  
 title continued to be applied to the cavalry squadrons mounted at public  
 expense (turmae equorum publicorum). Moreover, there were at first only

four jury panels, each of them containing barely a thousand iudices, since as yet provincials had not been admitted to this service. (31) The panels themselves, furthermore, were distinguished by various designations, depending upon whether they were composed of Tax Tribunes (tribuni aeris), Appointees (selecti), or Judges (iudices). And alongside of these there were the so-called Nine Hundred, chosen from the whole body to be keepers of the ballot boxes at elections. (32-33) The right to be enrolled among the equites was abused in various ways under the emperors Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius. (34) The Gracchi were the first to make the equites a separate order by called<sup>ing</sup> them iudices, and subsequently the prestige of the equestrian name was undermined in the various political quarrels, and the title came to be attached to the purchasers of state contracts (publicani), who for a considerable time constituted the third rank in the state. At last Marcus Cicero, when consul, put the equestrian title on a firm footing as a result of the Catilinarian affair. Since then the equestrian class has quite clearly become a third element in the state, and the name of the Equestrian Order has come to be added to the formula "The Senate and Roman People." This explains why even now it is written after "People," because it was the last element to be added. (35) As a matter of fact, the name equites has been subject to frequent changes, even in the case of those who were entitled to it from their service in the cavalry. They were styled Celeres under Romulus and the Kings, Flexuntes later, and, still later, Trossuli, as a result of their having captured without any help from the infantry a town of that name in Etruria nine miles this side of Volsinii; and the name Trossuli survived to the time of Gaius Gracchus and beyond,<sup>380</sup> (36) according at least to the friend named after him, Junius Gracchanus.

This locus classicus on the Equestrian Order, into which Pliny was led by a discussion on the use of metals in rings, is, in Nicolet's words, "rempli de données précieuses, mais souvent mal comprises et difficiles à interpréter".<sup>381</sup> Some of its details are confirmed elsewhere: e.g. the origin of the equites as aristocratic cavalry, Augustus' institution of four panels of jurors, the financial qualification for equestrian status, and the attaching of the name equites to the publicani. A good deal of Pliny's information, however, is found nowhere else.

In the main his account deals with two aspects of the Ordo Equester: first, the increase in the political importance of those with equestrian census during the period from the Gracchi to Cicero (by whose day they formed an easily identifiable group in the body politic); and, secondly, their consolidation into an official Order by AD23.

Thanks to Pliny, then, a history of the equites becomes, to some extent, possible. Originally they were the cavalry of the Roman state, the equites equo publico, and they continued to be known by this designation right down to Gracchan times and later. Pliny implies that these equites equo publico wore a gold ring and we know that they served in 18 centuries, all of them very aristocratic and 6 of them (the so-called sex stipendia) exceptionally so. But in the Gracchan period senators were excluded by law from the 18 centuries, and the way was opened for equites of a different stamp, parvenu nouveaux riches rather than aristocrats. In 123 Gaius Gracchus' law on the taxes of the province of Asia provided wealthy non-senators with an additional avenue to enrichment, and his friend Acilius Glabrio turned over the repetundae court to essentially the same class of men, who, however,<sup>382</sup> were officially called iudices and presumably wore an iron ring. The result was a transformation of the equites. By the first century BC the very

wealthy non-senatorial group, which included the powerful publicani and supplied jurors to the quaestiones perpetuae, claimed and increasingly received the title and the privileges of the old equites equo publico; indeed in 67 they were specifically recognised in the Lex Roscia Theatralis. In the 60's their importance and influence steadily increased when Cicero sought to promote concordia ordinum, that is, the making of political common cause by two classes with basically similar interests, senators and equites (whether wearers of gold rings or of iron ones). Perhaps it was at this time that Pliny's third element, the ordo equester, began to intrude into the traditional SPQR formula, although there seems to be no positive evidence for the use of such an expression as "Senatus Populusque Romanus et Equester Ordo."

Pliny suggests that formal organization of the ordo equester began under Augustus but was not fully achieved until the reign of Tiberius, when those equites who were equo publico with a gold ring and those equites who were iudices with an iron ring were amalgamated into a single body, all of whose members now obtained the right to wear the gold ring and thus be distinguished from the plebs. In this way a third order, intermediate between senate and plebs, was finally consolidated. But the trend to such consolidation had begun earlier and Pliny unfortunately does not date the beginning of the change with precision: he merely alludes to Augustus' organisation of jury panels and, by implication, to his substitution of a gold for an iron ring as the mark of the equestrian status. Pliny evidently thought that Augustus never made it absolutely clear who should get the gold ring. The ius anuli reserved for equites is, of course, attested much earlier: in Sulla's time, in 72, and in the age of Caesar; but it seems improbable that any except the equites equo publico were entitled to it then. When

the ius anuli first began to be extended to men with the equestrian census but without the public horse is unknown. Certainly it was not in Gaius Gracchus' time, nor probably in that of the younger Livius Drusus (the equites hated him, but we do not hear that these were specifically equites equo publico).<sup>390</sup> By the time of Augustus, however, the ius anuli may not, as is usually thought, have been exclusively restricted to the equites equo publico.<sup>391</sup> Be that as it may, it was in AD23 that equestrian status was carefully defined in law.<sup>392</sup> It was Augustus' action in reenacting the Lex Roscia Theatralis and in organising four panels of equestrian jurors to serve in the courts that paved the way to this development. So in AD23 it was laid down that henceforth equites were to be men of free birth descended from a freeborn father and a freeborn paternal grandfather and in possession of adequate means (the equestrian census being fixed at 400,000 sesterces) (with some provision, however, being made for the admission of freedmen to the status).

Valuable as Pliny's account is - and in its main outlines it is trustworthy -<sup>393</sup>, it is neither free from uncertainties nor complete. He, and his readers, knew well enough that from Cicero's day, if not earlier, iudices as well as possessors of an equus publicus were called equites.<sup>394</sup> Yet he seems to say that when Augustus established his four jury panels the majority of the jurors belonged to the iron-ring class and were called iudices and not equites, the latter title being reserved for the men with an equus publicus.<sup>395</sup> Jones argues that Pliny has here made a mistake. More probably he has expressed himself clumsily. What he means is that prior to Augustus, the title eques was given officially only to an equus equo publico. By AD19, however, it was being given, in an official document<sup>396</sup> such as the Tabula Hebana, to men who did not have the public horse. The

right to wear the gold ring was the crucial thing, and, to judge from Pliny, Augustus never made it <sup>r</sup> crystal clear precisely who was entitled to wear it. Perhaps in his reign some men besides the possessors of an equus publicus were authorized to wear it, even if Pliny is right in thinking that enrolment in the jury panels did not automatically carry the ius anuli with it. Iudices were equites without the gold ring and were hard to recruit in consequence. But as soon as the law of AD23 recognised iudices as full-fledged equites entitled to the gold ring, the Augustan jury panels were swamped with applicants and Gaius found it necessary to establish an additional panel. The ius anuli, in fact, was so coveted that men not entitled to it behaved as if they possessed it, including even freedmen. Pliny might have pointed out that, under certain conditions, freedmen could qualify for it, from AD24 on at any rate; but it was not particularly necessary for his account of the use of metals for rings to mention such a detail.

## Chapter 5

### An Analysis of the Major References

The Historia Naturalis contains some 860 references to events in Roman history from the beginning of the regal period down to the death of Augustus in AD14; and, besides these, there are some 178 additional references to events in the period between AD14 and AD77, the year in which the Elder Pliny dedicated the work to the Emperor Titus. This total of more than a thousand references is enough to show that in Pliny we are dealing with a figure of major consequence for Roman historiography. The nature of his contribution is worth study.

In Chapters 2, 3 and 4 an attempt has been made to show that the historical information supplied in his Major References is both abundant and important; and it is to be remembered that, in addition, there is the 401 host of minor references, containing a wide variety of miscellaneous details. These latter, even if hardly susceptible of useful comment and in some cases unimportant in themselves, nevertheless make their contribution to the Roman historian's pool of source materials. One might cite such examples as: 15.120-121, where Pliny mentions the two myrtle trees growing in the shrine of Quirinus, of which the one, the so-called patricians' myrtle, flourished until the time of the Social War when the other (or plebeian) myrtle began to grow strong in its place; 25.5-7, where Pliny describes Mithridates and his fame as a linguist and as a student of medicine; 17.1-6, where Pliny



records the rivalry between L. Crassus and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (the censors in 92), each of whom accused the other of living in unseemly luxury; 35.I99-201, where Pliny delivers an indignant tirade against various freedmen under both the Republic and the Principate, who had achieved some notoriety; 36.I01-II2, where Pliny gives a description of some of the more famous buildings in Rome.

Some general remarks on the Elder Pliny's historical references will be in order at this point. As we have seen, out of the 860 allusions in the Historia Naturalis to the Monarchy, Republic and Augustus' Principate it is possible to extract only some 109 Major References. These are distributed very unevenly over the work. Book 2, on cosmology (with 49 references in all), contains only 3 Major References; Books 3-6, on geography (with 59 references in all), contain 24 (17 in 3, 1 in 4, 2 in 5, 4 in 6); Books 7-11, on zoology (with 283 references in all), contain 28 (24 in 7, 1 in 8, 1 in 9, 1 in 10, 1 in 11); Books 12-27, on plants in general (12-19) and on plants in medicine (20-27) (with 193 references in all), contain 32 (4 in 12, 2 in 13, 1 in 14, 2 in 15, 5 in 16, 2 in 17, 6 in 18, 3 in 19, 0 in 20, 1 in 21, 5 in 22, 0 in 23, 0 in 24, 0 in 25, 1 in 26, 0 in 27); Books 28-32, on animals in medicine (with 33 references in all), contain 6 (2 in 28, 0 in 29, 1 in 30, 2 in 31, 1 in 32); Books 33-37, on metals and stones, including their use in medicine, art and architecture (with 243 references in all), contain 39 (15 in 33, 13 in 34, 2 in 35, 4 in 36, 5 in 37). It will thus be seen that sixty-nine, in other words about 52% of the 109 Major References (some of which are composite, thus bringing the total to 132) are concentrated in just four books (17 in 3, 24 in 7, 15 in 33,

13 in 34). Of the remaining books one contains 6 References, three contain 5 References each, three contain 4 References, two contain 3 References, seven contain 2 References, ten contain 1 Reference and six books contain no Major Reference at all.

This maldistribution is probably accidental. There is nothing very systematic or homogeneous about the information which the Major References provide, or about Pliny's manner of supplying it. It is clear that Pliny does have a marked fondness for "firsts," the first time that something happened, the first person to do a certain thing etc. Apart from this, however, his allusions to Roman history just happen. They are brought in, not according to some set scheme or pattern, but more or less haphazardly if not capriciously, either to tickle the reader's fancy, or to satisfy his Roman consciousness, or to indulge Pliny's fondness for the recondite and the abstruse. Most of the References are found just where one would expect to find them: in Book 3, which deals with the geography of Italy and the Mediterranean world west of Italy, and which thereby affords scope to Pliny's Italian bias (about which something will be said in the following chapter);<sup>402</sup> in Book 7, which deals with the human species; and in Books 33-37 (and especially 33 and 34), which deal with the minerals, whether metallic or lithic, that serve human greed and human vanity, a theme dear to the hearts of Roman writers in general and of Pliny in particular.

It is usually difficult to decide exactly how accurate and trustworthy the Major References are, inasmuch as, for most of them, Pliny is an unsupported source of information. The majority of them can, however, be deemed accurate, since the information they convey is not improbable in itself and at the same time there is no conflicting evidence to warrant

disbelief in them. Moreover, the few cases for which there is circumstantial evidence in corroboration, such as Reference 97 on the affair of Clesippus and Gegania (which seems confirmed by an inscription), inspire a certain degree of confidence in the rest. In the judgement of the writer, while six of the Major References are to be judged as indeterminate, seventy-one can be accepted as trustworthy. The remaining thirty-two either as a whole or in part appear to be unreliable. The thirty-two inaccuracies, however, do not seem to conform to any particular pattern. Some are errors in military matters, some in political, others in social, and so forth. Pliny's fallibility is as unpredictable as his selectivity. The mistakes are almost certainly due in part to the large amount of material Pliny needed to peruse (some 2000 volumina, as he himself tells us in his opening paragraphs) and to the pressure under which he was working: the entire, huge compilation had to be put together in the spare moments he could snatch from his official duties in the service of the Emperor. He obviously had little time for reflecting or checking.

However, another and equal, if not greater, reason for his errors is his uncritical attitude towards his sources. When it was a matter of giving items of natural history he would often disagree with his sources, checking through other authorities in order to arrive as close as possible to the truth. But when he introduced history of the more usual kind, it was mainly with a secondary purpose, to enliven and illustrate for the Roman reader what might have otherwise been an excessively recondite excursion into an unfamiliar area. He himself says that very few of the 2000 volumina that he perused were ever handled by students, owing to the abstruseness of their contents. Evidently he felt it his duty to peruse them carefully and to

collate all items dealing with out-of-the-way natural phenomena. But he felt no similar compulsion in the case of historical events and persons, and although he may have been very knowledgeable about the first century AD, which to judge from the titles of his lost historical works was his favourite period of history, he may not have been equally familiar with the Republic. At any rate, when dealing with the Republic, he seems to have taken over uncritically from his sources any material that seemed to suit his momentary purpose. He makes clear his own policy: "Nevertheless, in most instances of these I shall not myself pledge my own faith, and shall preferably ascribe the facts to the authorities who will be quoted for all doubtful points."<sup>405a</sup> Only very infrequently does he make critical comments on his historical references to the Republic. One concludes that his knowledge of Republican history was not as good as might have been expected from a Varro redivivus, since otherwise he would hardly have been content to relay the erroneous information found in his sources. At any rate he usually did not correct the errors he found in his predecessors, unless one is to assume that in almost every case he did it tacitly.

The inaccuracies in Pliny are, in general, of two kinds: mere slips due either to his sources' carelessness or to his own (and there are more than a few of these), and errors due to his poor judgement, or gullibility, in accepting as accurate information which is demonstrably false. Our list of Major References shows a number of mistakes which seem due to carelessness. He confuses the two Tarquins in re the building of the Capitoline temple (Reference 6); he claims that Alexander of Epirus died in the city of Mardonia (Reference 17); he says that Cn.Flavius who first published the pontifical calendar in 304, held both the patrician office of curule aedile

and the plebeian office of tribune of the plebs (Reference 22); he errs in giving Appius as the praenomen of the Claudius who was consul in 249 and in calling him the grandson of Appius Claudius Caecus (Reference 31); he wrongly states that C.Cornelius, cos. 197, had Quinctius Flaminius for his colleague (Reference 38); he seems to confuse P.Cornelius Scipio Nasica, who died in exile, with Scipio Africanus, who suffered a similar fate, or with P.Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, who, after engineering the death of Ti.Gracchus, went to Pergamum on a mission and there died (Reference 39); he calls Q.Fabius Allobrogicus the brother of Scipio Aemilianus instead of the nephew (Reference 49); he describes the town of Anticyra, whither Livius Drusus had repaired to seek a cure for epilepsy, as an island (Reference 58); he seems to place the censors of 89 BC, P.Licinius Crassus and L. Julius Caesar, one hundred years earlier (Reference 62); he confuses Pharsalia with Dyrrachium as the place where Caesar's army suffered from hunger in the Civil War (Reference 76); he claims that Caesar did not publish the casualties of the Civil Wars (Reference 78); he errs in saying that the senator M.Fidustius, who survived for 36 years after his proscription by Sulla (82-81 BC), was in the end proscribed by Antony (43-42 BC) (Reference 79); he attaches the Spanish shipwrecks sighted in the Red Sea over a century earlier by Eudoxus to the expedition of young C.Caesar (Reference 102).

Of the inaccuracies which result from Pliny's uncritical approach to his sources and which demonstrate his imperfect knowledge of the history of the Monarchy and of the Republic little need be added to what has already been said in the discussion of each at its appropriate place in the preceding chapters. (See References 1, 3, 4, 5, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25, 28, 35,

36, 44, 64, 65, 86, 95.) Needless to say, some of these errors show Pliny to be the dupe of historians who, in the interests of individuals or families, rewrote or invented the facts to suit their own purposes: as in the cases of Hostus Hostilius (Reference 3), of the gens Marcia (References 4, 5, 12), of the destruction of Volsinii by a thunderbolt (Reference 28), of the award of the corona graminea to Q. Fabius Maximus (Reference 36), of the exploit of Cn. Octavius, usually attributed to Popillius Laenas (Reference 44), of the interpretation of the omen of the bees alighting at Arbalo (Reference 95).

It is true, then, as the above review shows, that some of Pliny's information is faulty. Despite this, however, it can be fairly claimed that the body of historical knowledge that he gives us is largely trustworthy, and it is undoubtedly valuable and extensive. One can endorse his nephew's description of it as an "opus diffusum, eruditum nec minus varium quam ipsa natura." Without Pliny it would be impossible to give any meaningful account of the economic history of Republican Italy. He tells us the amount of gold and silver in the aerarium at different periods, he supplies information on Italian and imported Greek wines, and on the changing prices of wheat, olive oil and wine; <sup>409 he records</sup> the fact that a fine under the old laws at Rome was priced in cattle; he gives us details about the production of gold in Spain, the debasement and the counterfeiting of silver coinage; the high prices paid for various objets d'art etc. Nor without him could we have as full a conception of the contents of the XII Tables: it is he who preserves the clauses that it was permissible to gather up acorns falling on another person's land, that anybody wrongfully felling another man's trees should be fined 25 asses per tree, etc. Pliny likewise helps to fill out the account of Rome's relations with her Latin and other neighbours: he mentions, for instance, the statue in honour of C. Maenius, who had vanquished the

416

Prisci Latini.

Pliny's allusions to events otherwise totally unknown may, it is true, tantalize more than they illuminate. We would certainly like to know more about Marius' Rhone canals, the pearls in the ears of Venus in Agrippa's Pantheon, the details of the expeditions to the East of Lucullus, P. Petronius and others. References occur to otherwise unrecorded natural disasters: an earthquake in the district of Mutina, another during the battle of Lake Trasimene, famines in Egypt. Sometimes, too he is merely supplying additional corroborative (and occasionally confusing) details to what other ancient writers tell us: witness his remarks on the comet which appeared after the death of Caesar and Octavian's reaction to it, the captives at Carrhae after the disaster to Crassus, the halting of Antony's ship at Actium by a small sucking fish, Roman triumphs. Furthermore, in some cases the details he supplies may be regarded as curious trifles and very little more. Thus he illustrates elephants' innate sense of justice by recounting the story, recorded by Juba, that King Bocchus, in an attempt to punish thirty of the beasts, exposed them, tied to stakes, to a herd of the same number, only to discover that they could not be induced to perform the service of ministering to another's cruelty. Similarly trivial is the item that Drusus Caesar came to despise cabbages because of the influence of Apicius and was reproved therefore by his father Tiberius.

On the other hand, much of Pliny's information is anything but trifling. There is a world of difference between the items just mentioned and, for instance, the excursus on Mithridates or the Equestrian Order. These open up for us whole new segments of Roman history. What would we know, for instance, of Augustus' "Italianization" policy if it were not for Pliny, who tells us about the careers of men like the novus homo L. Tarius

432  
Rufus, or about the division of Italy into eleven regions, etc. 433

Cumulatively, Pliny's historical references, the major and the minor ones alike, help to make Roman history much more vivid and alive. Above all, the city of Rome and its worthies spring out of his pages on numerous occasions. In particular, it is only by perusing Pliny that one gets a good idea of some of the greatest personalities in Roman history. Thanks to him, Cato the Elder (Reference 47), Pompey (References 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74), Antony (References 79, 80, 81, 87), Caesar (References 76, 78), and even the enigmatic Augustus himself (References 83, 85, 88, 91, 98, 101, 104, 106, 108, 109) become real persons of flesh and blood and with three dimensions. And, as Pliny says, "there is no greater kind of happiness than that all people for all time should desire to know what kind of man a person was."

The sources on which Pliny depended for various aspects of his huge mass of information have been often investigated and in some detail, most recently by K.G. Sallmann. But such studies have usually been of the piecemeal kind and deal only with some specific section of the Historia Naturalis, such as the geographical books, the medical books, or the books on the history of art. None of these areas, however, concern us here. It is his historical references that interest us, and they have only once been the subject of detailed investigation, and that was over three quarters of a century ago, when F. Münzer published his Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius. The growth of knowledge suggests that a fresh look would be appropriate.

Pliny himself informs us that his information for the Historia Naturalis as a whole was derived from one hundred special authors ("ex



445  
 exquisitis auctoribus centum")<sup>n</sup>). In fact he used many more than that,  
 either directly or indirectly, whom presumably he did not regard as  
 special. A count of the authorities listed in the Index Auctorum in Book  
 1 reveals almost 500 different names, divided into Roman and non-Roman  
 authors. Some of these names appear to have been added merely to fill up  
 the list of authorities in each area for the sake of scholarly completeness.<sup>447</sup>  
 Others, however, belong to the hundred main authorities whom Pliny consulted  
 directly,<sup>448</sup> and yet others belong to those authors whom he found quoted  
 (not always by name)<sup>449</sup> by his select hundred and whom he himself seems to  
 have sometimes consulted when occasion demanded. Many of the 500 authors,  
 of course, have no bearing on this study, since they furnished Pliny only  
 with information on natural history and with nothing on Roman history. Our  
 concern is with the source, or sources, of his historical references, especial-  
 ly the major ones. For the 860 historical references which deal with the  
 period down to the death of Augustus, Pliny actually names some 40 authors.<sup>450</sup>  
 Not surprisingly, these are Roman for the most part and some of them are  
 cited more than once in the same book. Their names follow, listed in the  
 order of their appearance in the Historia Naturalis: the bracketed numbers  
 after each name indicate the books in which that particular author is cited:  
 Coelius Antipater (2), Valerius Antias (2, 13, 34), Lucius Piso (2, 3, 8, 13,  
 15, 17, 28, 33, 34), Cornelius Nepos (2, 3, 16, 33, 36), Theopompus (3),  
 Cleitarchus (3), M. Terentius Varro (3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 18, 22, 25, 33, 36,  
 37), Cornelius Valerianus (3), Sempronius Tuditanus (3?, 13), Polybius (5, 8).  
 Juba (6), annales (7, 8, 10, 26, 34), Masurius Sabinus (7, 15, 16), Ennius (7),  
 Pedianus Asconius (7), Verrius Flaccus (7, 8, 18, 28, 33), acta (7), Fabius  
 Vestalis (7), Cicero (7), Cato the Elder (8), Turranius Gracilis (9), Fenes-  
 tella (9, 15, 33), Aelius Stilo (9), Fabius Pictor (10, 14), Oppius (11),

Cassius Hemina (13, 29, 32), Fabius Dossenus (14), Scaevola (14), L. Aelius (14), Ateius Capito (14, 18), Tergilla (14), M. Antonius (14), C. Epidius (17), Commentarii Pontificum (18), Laurea Tullius (31), Timaeus (33), Messalla orator (33, 35), Messalla senex (34, 35), Annus Fetialis (34), Metrodorus Scepsis (34). He cites no sources for the historical references which he inserts in Books 4, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 27, 30.

It seems clear that Pliny's practice was to use a few chief sources, the experts in each field, directly, and to consult the others, as a rule, indirectly. This is the logical inference from his own remarks about comparing sources<sup>451</sup> and about his decision to follow no one authority for a whole area, but rather the expert in each section.<sup>452</sup> Thus he did not use one main source for the whole of a given field, such as cosmology, or geography, or medicine, etc. At the same time, however, he did not take fragments from a multitude of sources and assemble them like a mosaic. Rather, his practice was to consult one main source, comparing it with others as the occasion arose. His nephew has left us a vivid picture of his way of working: his habit was to have books read to him at every possible opportunity, and from these books he excerpted whatever seemed likely to prove<sup>453</sup> germane to his purpose.

Of his indirect use of sources, we have some indication in his own statement, that, in comparing authors, he often found whole sections taken over from other writers without acknowledgement:<sup>454</sup> had he himself consulted the other authors in question, he would have known whose was probably the correct version. Some of the works Pliny quotes have survived, Cato's De Agri Cultura for instance; and his occasional misquotation of them, when not due to mere carelessness, is additional evidence that he used some

455

sources indirectly through another author, though usually without citing his direct source.

Of the 40 auctores listed above four would appear to have been used much more frequently and much more continuously than the others: namely Piso, Varro, Nepos and Verrius Flaccus. We cannot be sure, however, that Pliny invariably used them directly. As for the other 36, it appears likely that they were used indirectly for the most part, although, when occasion arose, Pliny did consult directly, and even quote verbatim, authors whose work he usually knew only at second hand.

456

There can be little doubt that the main source for Pliny's information about Roman history for the period of the Monarchy and the Republic was M. Terentius Varro, although it is usually impossible to identify which work of Varro supplied any given reference. The signs of Varro's importance as a source for Pliny are very numerous. He appears in the Index Auctorum for all but five books (namely, books 9, 24, 25, 27, 32) of the Historia Naturalis and he is usually named at or very near the top of the list for every one of the other thirty-one books. He is actually named in the text as a source at least once, and often several times, in all but nine of the books. Pliny himself pays tribute to Varro in several passages. Thus he records how Varro was the first to receive the corona navalis (from Pompey in the Pirate War), whereas all other ancient authorities aver that no one had ever won it until Octavian awarded it to M. Agrippa. He also expatiates on another honour paid to Varro, this time by Asinius Pollio. When Pollio founded his library at Rome, the only statue of a living person erected in it was that of M. Varro, and, as Pliny says, "the bestowal by a leading orator and citizen of this crowning honour on one only out of the

457

multitude of men of genius then existing constituted no less a distinction, in my own opinion, than when Pompey the Great gave to that same Varro a naval crown for his conduct in the war with the pirates." Pliny, be it noted, is the only ancient writer to mention these honours for Varro. Pliny also draws attention to Varro's remarkable achievement in publishing his treatise on agriculture when over 80 years old; and he also lauds Varro for having inserted in some of his works the portraits of seven hundred famous people, becoming thereby (in Pliny's words) "the inventor of a benefit that even the gods might envy, since he not only bestowed immortality but dispatched it all over the world, enabling his subjects to be ubiquitous like the gods. This was a service which Varro rendered to strangers." One of the favoured seven hundred was undoubtedly Pompey and Pliny's consistently favourable picture of him may well derive from Varro, who, as we have just seen, received the signal honour of the corona navalis from Pompey and was always determinedly loyal to him: Pliny's allusions to Pompey are free of the derogatory remarks which, in the case of other illustrious men, he apparently could not resist making sooner or later. Finally, the Italian flavour in Pliny, about which more will be said in the following chapter, could quite well come from Varro.

It seems probable that Varro is also responsible for much of Pliny's untrustworthy information. Of the thirty-two demonstrably inaccurate References two (5 and 31) can be traced directly to Varro, since he is actually cited by Pliny as their source, while the remaining thirty occur in books for which, to judge from the Index Auctorum, Varro was a principal source. Munzer has plausibly argued that at least fifteen of these References not only derive from Varro, but in all probability were taken from him directly.

The learned Varro, then, appears to have been Pliny's main source

of information for the period of the Monarchy and the Republic, <sup>465</sup> being himself the original fountain of knowledge for some items (such as the information on Pompey), and for others the purveyor of information from earlier writings (like those of Fabius Pictor, the Edicts of the Censors, Cassius Hemina, L. Piso, Valerius Antias, the accounts of prodigies, the XII Tables and Roman economic records), or the mediator of writers contemporary with himself (such as Cicero and Annius Fetialis). <sup>466</sup> It is this which makes Pliny for us the great repository of the antiquarian tradition in Roman republican history, just as Livy is for the annalistic. <sup>467</sup> The profusion and the variety of the sources, not all of them reliable, on which Varro drew help to explain the great number of Pliny's historical allusions and justify our describing him, in the words Livy applied to Polybius, as haudquaquam <sup>468</sup> spernendus auctor, or, as Pliny himself says of Varro, non in grege <sup>469</sup> nominandus.

It is worth noting, however, that Varro was not the only source used by Pliny. He cites inscriptions from monuments and statues, like that of Sempronius Tuditanus, the conqueror of the Histrians. <sup>470</sup> He used family archives, perhaps more often than he bothers to say: he certainly seems to have been familiar with the records of the Julii Caesares and of the Caecilii <sup>471</sup> Metelli. <sup>472</sup> Finally, he was not above using even his own earlier works, <sup>473</sup> De Iaculatione Equestri, <sup>474</sup> De Vita Pomponii Secundi, <sup>475</sup> and Bella Germaniae.

Pliny's list of sources, in fact, reads like a roll-call of all those who, before his time, had written on the Roman Monarchy, the Roman Republic, and the Augustan Principate. In a way, therefore, the Historia Naturalis reveals what Roman historiography was like in the days from Fabius Pictor to Emperor Caesar Augustus. The revelation, however, will not

strike most readers as startlingly new. Pliny simply confirms the picture that has long been familiar as the result of the implications of statements in the surviving portions of Livy and Dionysius (the former of whom is of course among those he cites), although presumably it is not from them that those references derive, which have been adduced in this study as "major" by reason of their contributing something of importance, otherwise unrecorded in the extant literature, to our knowledge of Roman history.

For Books 5,7,8,10, 37 Pliny also claims to have consulted archival material in the shape of acta or acta triumphorum. Whether he also looked at inscriptions as well seems more doubtful. It is true that he occasionally purports to quote inscriptions verbatim. But his quotations are not always reliable, so that it is unlikely that they are the result of personal autopsy. His assertion that the inscription on the statue of Tuditanus, conqueror of the Histrians, records 1000 stades as the distance from Aquileia to the River Tityus (whereas 2000 stades would be nearer the mark) may be due to the erosion of a letter M on the stone or to some scribe's faulty copying of a MS (Reference 50). And his account of the documents paraded at Pompey's triumph may seem confused to us because of the imperfection of our knowledge of all the circumstances (References 71, 72). But what is one to say of the most celebrated inscription he quotes (Reference 98)? This is the one that adorned the Tropaeum Augusti above Monte Carlo and which identified forty-six Alpine tribes incorporated by Augustus. Pliny's language might mean that he had read and copied the inscription, just as elsewhere his language seems to imply that he had visited and studied a similar tropaeum which Pompey had erected in the Pyrenees (Reference 67). But Pliny does not positively say that his account of the inscription was

actually taken by himself from the monument. As it happens, the monument survives, together with a few small scraps of its inscription. Meagre though they are, these fragments are sufficient to convict Pliny of error: he gives Triumpilini instead of Trumpilini as the name of one of the subjugated tribes, the correctness of the latter being proven by one of the few extant fragments. The mistake is venial, no doubt, and could be due to mere carelessness (either of Pliny or of some MS-copyist). But what follows is far less trivial (Reference 98). His assertion that the civitates Cottianae numbered fifteen and were not among the forty-six he lists on the Tropaeum Augusti seems to be completely in error. The inscription on the Arch of Augustus at Susa shows that the civitates Cottianae were fourteen in number, not fifteen; moreover, he has listed six of them, presumably without realising it, among the Alpine tribes on the Tropaeum Augusti, misspelling the names of two of them in the process (he writes Edanates and Esubiani instead of Adanates and Vesubiani). All of this suggests that Pliny had not bothered to study the Tropaeum Augusti, even though he had undoubtedly had opportunities for visiting it.

476

477

One concludes that, like Livy, and most Roman historians, Pliny did not appreciate the importance of inspecting inscriptions and copying them accurately. His historical methods, in other words, seem to have been quite conventional.

## Chapter 6

### Pliny as a Roman Historian

Manifestly, the Elder Pliny thought of himself as, first and foremost, an historian. He advertised himself as such by the titles he gave to his works, titles such as Bella Germaniae and A Fine Aufidi Bassi, and even that of his magnum opus for that matter: Historia Naturalis. Moreover, the fact that he introduced so many historical items, and a high proportion of them "new" items at that (511 out of a total of 860), into what is professedly an encyclopaedia dealing with other things than the political activities of man is further evidence that his bent was historical. In fact, his nephew implies that all of his writing, the whole enormous bulk of it, would have been of the historical kind, had not the tyranny of Nero made it seem more prudent for him to devote his talents to literary topics for some years. If he was thus given over to the pursuit and practice of history, it is obviously necessary to discover, if possible, what kind of an historian he was.

As an historian of the first century AD he has been the subject of much discussion. The exercise is fraught with uncommon difficulty, since, apart from their titles, we know very little about Pliny's straight historical works, they being the ones that dealt with the period after Christ. Allusions to them by ancient writers are rare, as we shall see. They are certainly not "repeatedly" cited by Tacitus, despite occasional assertions to that effect. Tacitus names Pliny only four times in all (once in the



480

Histories and three times in the Annals), and even though there are a great number of passages in Tacitus where someone or other thinks Pliny to be the source, and adduces good, plausible, and perhaps what appear to be convincing reasons for this opinion, one can never be absolutely sure that they do in fact derive from him. The best proof of this is the failure of the scholars concerned to arrive at even approximately similar conclusions about Tacitus' use of him. According to Momigliano<sup>481</sup> and Townend<sup>482</sup> Pliny is a major source for Tacitus, whereas for Leeman<sup>483</sup> and Wilkes<sup>484</sup> (and, one suspects, for Syme<sup>485</sup>) Pliny was not a writer very highly regarded by Tacitus and therefore probably not extensively used by him. In this connection, it is not irrelevant to point out that on the four occasions when Tacitus actually names Pliny as the author of a variant account, he criticizes him once, seems to disparage him once, and somewhat conspicuously, omits to endorse him<sup>486</sup> twice.

From this it would seem to follow that it will not prove very conclusive merely to go to the pages of Tacitus and other ancient writers in order to discover how good or bad an historian Pliny was. It would seem to be essential, in addition, to examine the items of a historical nature in the Historia Naturalis, all the more so perhaps since what Pliny has to say on the history of the period before the common era seems to have been very much neglected. Admittedly, caution is necessary. One must constantly bear in mind that his gigantic compendium did not pretend to be anything more than a collection of notes; and this makes it very different in kind from, say, a history of the German wars, consciously planned, conscientiously prepared, and carefully completed as such. Pliny himself in the Praefatio to the Historia Naturalis is explicit on this point, and he goes

even further, contrasting his compilation of an encyclopaedia (for that is what the Historia Naturalis is) with his composition of a work like the A Fine Aufidi Bassi, that could be fairly regarded as authentically historical. Yet even when full allowance is made for the fact that incidental, capricious and haphazard allusions to sporadic historical events in a work like the Historia Naturalis are bound to differ in quality, as well as in quantity, from a closely researched and continuous account of a given period in history, the historical references in the Historia Naturalis may, nevertheless, be sufficiently revealing to enable one to form some idea of Pliny's historical methods in general, his approach to Roman history in particular, and his value to later students of it.

One's initial reaction is to dismiss Pliny, somewhat impatiently, as an historian of small consequence and to pronounce him a mere purveyor of trivia. Already in Chapter I his fondness for the curious and the unusual has been noted. Attention was there drawn to his relish for omens despite his own disclaimer ("naturae opera, non prodigia consecretamur"<sup>488</sup>), and to his very marked predilection for drawing attention to the first time that something happened. His search for the abstruse is everywhere apparent in the Historia Naturalis and in the historical references it contains. At times Pliny gives the impression that he is more concerned with human quirks than with human qualities, and his allusions to political and military events often appear to display more interest in the first time that the Romans did something than in their more lasting accomplishments. From all of this one is left with the impression that Pliny was not a historian of high seriousness. Gratia placendi seems to prevail over utilitas iuvandi. Of the 511 references that give new information about the period of the Monarchy and the

Republic, only about a quarter, in the present writer's opinion, supply information that is of real historical significance.

This preference for curious and out-of-the-way items must be due in the first instance to the antiquarian bent that led Pliny to admire Varro so extravagantly and to rely so heavily upon him, <sup>489</sup> rather than upon the annalistic tradition represented by Livy, <sup>490</sup> to supply gobbets of Republican history with which to embellish his exposition of natural phenomena.

Contemporary taste, however, may have reinforced this instinct of Pliny's for the abstruse. <sup>491</sup> It is not unreasonable to conjecture that he hoped to attract readers whose appetite had been whetted by the publication in AD63 or thereabouts of Seneca's Quaestiones Naturales, a work that also dealt with nature. Seneca's work, it is true, did not refer much to Roman history. <sup>492</sup> The difference in outlook between the two authors is reflected in the frequency with which they allude to events of an historical nature. The Quaestiones Naturales covers roughly the same body of material as Book 2 of the Historia Naturalis. But although it is two and a half times as long as the latter, <sup>493</sup> it contains only half as much historical material: some 40 references to Greek and Roman history <sup>494</sup> as compared with about 80. Seneca's real interest was in using the Quaestiones Naturales as a vehicle for Stoic moralizing. To a limited extent this is true also for Pliny, as we shall see. But in Pliny's references to Roman history the Stoic flavour is not markedly obtrusive; they are much more likely to smack of patriotic fervour, something that is not particularly in evidence in the Quaestiones. Basically, Seneca's approach is philosophical, while Pliny's innate inclination to seize upon any item of a recondite nature was stimulated when Seneca's work demonstrated that the Roman reading public was keen to learn

about such things.

It would be a mistake, however, to think of the Historia Naturalis as mentioning only the more curious anecdotes from Roman history. One might get that overall impression from a first reading. But a judgement based on first impressions is only too likely to be superficial, and there are after all 109 items of substantial consequence (and more than that, if the period from AD14 to 79 were to be included). A more searching inspection of Pliny's historical capacities is justified.

To judge from the Historia Naturalis he was certainly not a critical historian. According to the Younger Pliny, he used to say that "there was no book so bad that some good could not be got out of it."<sup>495</sup> This conviction of his seems to have affected his practice. At any rate, any and all historical information that might illustrate his natural history was grist to his mill, and normally it is rather uncritically introduced, just as it stood, from his source, whether the source was good or bad. Pliny is quite capable of inserting indiscriminately the items that his sources supply, even if it involves him in inconsistencies and inaccuracies.

Thus he records, in Reference 6, that the spoils from the capture of Apiolae were used to start the building of the Capitolium, which contradicts the traditional view, also recorded by Pliny, that the building was made with the spoils obtained from the capture of Suessa Pometia. Presumably he derived both pieces of information from different sources but, uncritically,<sup>496</sup> failed to notice and reconcile the difference between them. Again, take his account of P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, cos. 191 (Reference 39). Pliny says that, though judged by the Senate to be once and for all the finest man since the beginning of time, this Scipio Nasica was not

permitted to die in his native land. Here it seems that either Pliny or his source has confused this Scipio with Scipio Africanus or with P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, cos. 138. Reference 44 provides yet another example. There Pliny says that Cn. Octavius led a mission to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the king of Syria, whom the Senate wished to prevent from making war on Egypt. He is apparently unaware that the tradition unanimously assigns this mission to C. Popillius Laenas. Pliny's source probably had wished to flatter the family of Octavian (the later Augustus) and accordingly named Octavius, and Pliny accepted this uncritically. In somewhat similar fashion, in Reference 86, Pliny seems to have accepted Agrippa's statement that he built the Aqua Virgo in his aedileship of 33, whereas in fact that structure was not built until 19.

In fact, Pliny's uncritical approach renders him only too likely to accept any gobblet<sup>of</sup> information no matter how absurd. Thus he attributes the first incursion of the Gauls into Italy to the circumstances that a Gallic citizen from Switzerland named Helico, who had sojourned at Rome on account of his skill as an artificer, had brought with him when he came back some dried figs and grapes and some samples of oil and wine (Reference 14). He even admits his readiness to accept the exaggerations of family histories.<sup>497</sup> He tries hard, but will convince no one, that the books found on the Janiculum in 181 really did belong to Numa (Reference 42). His motive for Crassus' expedition against the Parthians, namely to obtain their gold, seems more than a little naive.<sup>498</sup> Absurd also is the story, based on the authority of the elder Messalla, of the miraculous coin of the Servilian family that ate gold and silver and by its changes prophesied the fortunes of the clan.<sup>499</sup>

When dealing with natural history he does sometimes raise objections

to facts or statements that he found in his sources, and he even does this occasionally when alluding to Roman history. For instance, he points out (Reference 18) that Theophrastus was the first foreigner to write with special care about the Romans, "for Theopompus, before whom nobody mentioned them, merely states that Rome was taken by the Gauls, and Cleitarchus, the next after him, only that an embassy was sent to Alexander." In his contention that rings were not in common use before the time of Cn.Flavius (Reference 22) he disagrees with the statement, found "in the oldest annals," that the equester ordo, indignant at Flavius' actions, laid aside their rings. Again, in recording the oddity of a Metellus who was so inarticulate that he suffered agony for months while rehearsing his speech of dedication of a temple to Ops, Pliny manifests some surprise, if not scepticism, by using verbs such as accipimus and credatur.<sup>500</sup> Contesting Varro's assertion that paper was not used before the victory of Alexander the Great and the foundation of Alexandria, Pliny adduces the discovery of the books of Numa to show that the use of paper went back at least to the period of the early kings of Rome (Reference 42). He also expresses some doubt as to the veracity of Sulla's claim to have won the corona graminea at the ~~seige~~ siege of Nola (Reference 59). But, as a rule, in his treatment of Roman history he is simply content to adduce examples without comment. No doubt all that he really wanted to do was to illustrate points of natural history (which, for the practical Roman, helped to remove science from the realm of mere theory and related it more to man);<sup>501</sup> or possibly his aim was to give a patriotic and Italic flavour to a work which, in other respects, often relies heavily on Greek sources.<sup>502</sup> Even so, it has to be admitted that on the whole his approach to Roman history in the Historia Naturalis seems very uncritical.<sup>503</sup>

Pliny can be charged with carelessness as well as with a failure to use his critical faculty. Attention has been drawn in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 to various mistakes, sometimes gross ones, that he makes. Some of these are presumably due to his sources, as, for example, his account of the early achievements of the gens Marcia (References 4, 5, 12), of the 'mission' of Cn. Octavius (Reference 44), or of the significance of the bees alighting at Arbalo (Reference 95). Other mistakes, however, seem to be due to sheer carelessness on his part, such as his statement that C.Aelius was tr.plebis in 285 instead of consul in 286 (Reference 23), that Cornelius Cethegus and Quinctius Flaminius were colleagues in the consulship (Reference 38), that Fabius Allobrogicus was the brother of Scipio Aemilianus (Reference 49), or that Caesar's army suffered from hunger at Pharsalia (Reference 76). His omnivorous interests, his habit of quoting from memory, and the speed of his reading and writing (attested by his nephew) contributed, it may be supposed, to this carelessness.<sup>504</sup> His handling of his source material was also in part responsible.

For Pliny in his magnum opus natural history was, inevitably, the principal theme; any other form of history was only incidental. In the work his approach to the two areas, the principal and the incidental, was perhaps inevitably bound to differ. As we have seen in the previous chapter, when dealing with natural history, his habit was to rely on one source at a time, namely the one he thought best for the topic under discussion;<sup>505</sup> but he did also, as occasion demanded, look up other authorities on natural history to compare and criticize their accounts and to supplement his primary source with additional information.<sup>506</sup> By contrast, when he inserted incidental material, such as allusions to Roman history, his usual practice

seems to have been simply to take it over as it stood from his source without checking other authorities, sometimes even without taking care to alter the chronology of his source, so as to make it conform to his own. 507

Behind some of Pliny's mistakes, in addition to his lack of critical approach and his carelessness, may also lie his partiality for or against well-known figures in Roman history. He was not, and does not seem seriously to have tried to be, objective. He was not writing sine ira et studio. In his references in the Historia Naturalis to the emperors after Augustus Pliny confines his remarks mostly to Tiberius, Gaius and Nero, and he castigates them for their cruelty, greed and luxury. This is pro-Flavian bias no doubt, but it is also symptomatic of his attitude in general. In his delineation of personages in the period before the death of Augustus, which is the subject of the present study, he is equally prone to show favouritism or its opposite. At first sight there appears to be no pattern to this lack of objectivity, since he shows his partiality either for or against the various figures seemingly at random. Nevertheless a connecting thread is discernible throughout the whole work, a thread that is revealed by Pliny's attitude towards the Flavian ruling house of his own day. Unlike Lucan and Tacitus, Pliny accepted the Principate as a fait accompli. He came from the equestrian class and could have no share in the glories of senatorial ancestors in the distant Republic or even of senatorial traditions in his own day. As a loyal equestrian he looks upon the rule of the Flavians as a good thing. In fact, with the exception of the time-serving Flavius Josephus, he is the most pro-Flavian of the Roman historians. True, he does not give any detailed account of the Flavians in the Historia Naturalis. But there was no need for him to do so; he had already dealt with Flavian fortunes



508

in the later parts of the A Fine Aufidi Bassi. But he does make it  
509  
clear that he looks to the Flavians to regenerate the State.

If we look at it from Pliny's point of view, the reason is not far to seek. The Flavians had rescued the Roman world from the disorders of the Civil Wars of AD 68-69, and this dominates his picture of Vespasian. Of the latter he says, "for mortal to aid mortal - this is god; and this is the road to eternalglory: by this road went our Roman chieftains, by this road now proceeds with heavenward step, escorted by his children, the greatest ruler of all time, Vespasianus Augustus, coming to the succour of  
510  
an exhausted world." Again, he speaks of the "salutaris exortus Vespasiani  
511  
imperatoris...", of the peace brought by Vespasian and more than once of  
512  
the Temple of Peace dedicated by Vespasian in AD75. Finally, as an honour to the Flavians, the Historia Naturalis is itself dedicated to the current emperor, Titus, the son of Vespasian, as we learn from the Praefatio of the  
513  
work. This pro-Flavian partiality affects his view of the worth of the figures of Republican times. Pliny seems to apply only one criterion: whether a man fostered unity within the state or whether he produced disunity; and he uncritically accepts the judgement of others as to where responsibility for discord lay. Thus he takes a stand against tribunes of the plebs, who by their seditious actions stirred up the people, and thereby caused a shift of power from public into private hands: he specifically names Gaius Gracchus as one who curried favour with the people and humiliated the Senate by laying the  
514  
foundations for the creation of the new ordo of the Equites. He likewise castigates Sulla for his part in the Civil War in which he was responsible for the deaths of so many of his fellow citizens, not only in the war itself,  
515  
but also in the proscriptions after it. Pompey, who is generally mentioned in complimentary terms throughout the Historia Naturalis, receives particular

516

praise for having terminated the Civil War with Sertorius. Catiline  
 517  
 is damned for attempting revolution and Cicero is lauded for stopping  
 518  
 him. Crassus is condemned because of his eagerness to get his hands on  
 519  
 the Parthian gold and the consequent destruction of a Roman army. Cicero's  
 "proscription" of Antony, not surprisingly, is commended, since Antony  
 520  
 sought to split the Roman state. And, no less surprisingly, Antony's  
 521  
 action in joining Cleopatra and provoking a Civil War is roundly condemned.  
 If Pliny is ambiguous in his attitude towards Julius Caesar, praising him  
 522  
 for his talents and accomplishments, but castigating him for having caused  
 523  
 in the Civil War the deaths of so many of his fellow citizens, it is probably  
 because he is uncritically reproducing discrepant sources. In this regard  
 Pliny's remarks on the civic crown of oak leaves is instructive. According  
 to him that glorious emblem of military valour had now, and for a long time  
 past, become an emblem of the emperor's clemency, ever since in fact the  
 impiety of the Civil Wars had converted the duty not to kill a fellow citizen  
 into a positive merit. Small wonder that Augustus had received this decora-  
 524  
 tion from the whole of mankind as the saviour of his country. Nor was that  
 all. Augustus is also compared by Pliny with Q. Fabius Maximus who, to echo  
 the famous words of Ennius, restored all Rome's fortunes and as a result  
 received the even rarer tribute of a grass crown, and received it, not from  
 the hands of his soldiers in the normal way, but quite exceptionally from  
 the hand of the State itself: and Pliny is careful to add that Fabius' grass crown  
 525  
 was the only one to be given by tota Italia. These last two words at once  
 call to mind Augustus' slogan against Antony; moreover, Augustus, too, was  
 awarded the grass crown, and in his case also it was awarded, not by the  
 526  
 soldiers, but by the Senate.

The Flavians, by putting an end to the anarchy of the year of the four emperors, had indeed come to the "succour of an exhausted world." For Pliny this world meant in effect Rome and Italy. He obviously shared the view, common from Augustus on, that Rome and Italy had now become one; they were synonymous. His allusions to Roman history testify eloquently to his outlook. Of the total of 860 references to the period before the death of Augustus, eighty per cent, four-fifths of them, refer to events in Italy. In particular, of the 109 Major References, which have been examined in Chapters 2, 3 and 4, 88 are concerned with events in Italy and 5 with events in the western Mediterranean, namely Sicily, Gaul and Spain. One is forced to conclude that the Historia Naturalis, while universal in its scientific interests, is rather narrow in its outlook on Roman history. Long before the end of the Roman Republic the world of Rome included many lands besides Italy and Pliny himself had served in some of them. Yet he largely ignores what happened in these areas, even though his geographical chapters in Books 3-6 are necessarily obliged to mention them. For him it was Italy that mattered. This is confirmed by the frequent praises of Italy scattered throughout the work.<sup>527</sup> He lapses into eulogy so often that he feels the need almost to apologize for it: "de natura sermo, non de Italia est."<sup>528</sup>

Pliny's especial interest in Italy would be unknown to us were it not for the Historia Naturalis, the references from his other works being too few to admit of any such judgement. The most significant remark along these lines, written no doubt for Flavian ears, is: "...breviterque una cunctarum gentium in toto orbe patria (=Italia) fieret."<sup>529</sup> This is a bold thought in Pliny, transcending and altering, in effect, Cicero's "...duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis,"<sup>530</sup> and Roman Vergil's "tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento."<sup>531</sup> Pliny is saying that under

the Flavians Italy has become the communis patria of the world, hitherto  
 an "orbis discors et in regna, hoc est in membra, divisus." This "Italian-<sup>532</sup>  
 ism" of the second half of the first century AD was the ultimate fruit of  
 the Social War of the early first century BC and of Augustus' policy (so  
 abundantly illuminated by Pliny's historical references) of using Italians  
 in prominent positions.<sup>533</sup> It is probably no exaggeration to say that Pliny's  
 obvious partiality for the Flavians is partly due to the fact that they were  
 above all an Italian dynasty. Be that as it may, he was himself from Cisal-  
 pine Gaul, and he almost makes his Historia Naturalis a political instrument  
 for celebrating the glories of a Republican Rome, which, in his view, had  
 evolved into an Imperial Italy under the Flavians.<sup>534</sup> Pliny's patriotism,  
 in fact, is much more strongly expressed than that of other writers in the  
 imperial age. One must go back to the Republic, to Cicero, Varro, and Vergil  
 for precedents.

Certain it is that Italy is what looms large in Pliny's historical  
 consciousness; and surprise sometimes has been expressed at his lack of  
 interest in the rest of the Empire,<sup>535</sup> seeing that he had undoubtedly served  
 as an imperial officer in various parts of it, - in territories such as  
 Germania Inferior, Hispania Tarraconensis, Gallia Narbonensis and Gallia  
 Belgica.<sup>536</sup> Perhaps some of the items in the Historia Naturalis are due to  
 his sojourns in western Europe. His knowledge of the Druids, for instance,  
 presumably stems from his service in Belgica.<sup>537</sup> But in general he is curiously  
 indifferent to the provinces. As far as the western provinces are concerned,  
 he may have felt that he had already written enough about them in such works  
 as his De Iaculatione Equestri, De Vita Pomponi Secundi and Bella Germaniae.  
 But he had no such reason for neglecting the eastern provinces. Perhaps he  
 had some personal knowledge of them, but he certainly shows no lively<sup>538</sup>

interest in them. In fact he is more prone to error when dealing with the Greek-speaking east than with other regions. This can be seen in Books 3 to 6, where he is giving his geographical account of the Mediterranean world. Incalculably valuable as his geographical chapters are, they have to be used with caution. This is particularly true of the books and chapters that deal with the east, despite the fact that he may have served in equestrian posts there and possessed the same kind of first-hand personal familiarity with them as he did with certain provinces in the west. His account of Asia Minor is not fully up-to-date or complete for Augustus' reign and his description of Syria in Augustus' time contains serious errors. His description of the nomes of Egypt, even if it is based on official documents, is very confused and disordered; and for the towns of Cyprus he appears not to have used any official registers at all, but to have relied on what he remembered from his reading of history and mythology.

The items of Roman republican history that Pliny has seen fit to include in the Historia Naturalis, for all their great value per se, do not stamp him as an historian of marked originality. They seem rather to indicate that his historical approach was of a traditional Roman kind. He takes Roman superiority and right to rule for granted and casually assumes that Rome's indefinite expansion and greatness were inevitable, if not indeed pre-determined.

The shortcomings noted in his Major References, and in the minor ones, too, for that matter, suggest that, like other Roman writers of history, he modelled himself on the Hellenistic historians and adopted methods and techniques similar to theirs. Like Duris of Samos he has a predilection for the unusual, the marvellous, even the fabulous. Like Timaeus he is "full of dreams, prodigies, and a womanish love of strange events."

Like Posidonius he is sometimes prone to pontificate.

← And like Livy, Roman follower par excellence of the Hellenistic historians, he enlivens and variegates his work by introducing deverticula  
 544 545  
amoena, digressions to alleviate the reader's tedium.

In another aspect, too, his writing is of the usual Roman kind. Like all Roman historians, from Cato onwards, he shows Stoic influence. It is noticeable in his naive puritanism and in the shallow moralizing which causes him throughout the Historia Naturalis to lament the decay of contemporary morals as compared with those of the past. This is not to say that Pliny was a Stoic philosopher. But there is a Stoic colouring to his work, or more accurately a neo-Stoic colouring: it is noticeable especially, for instance, in Book 7, where he deals with human behaviour and where, if anywhere, one might have expected it. Not that he reflects the rigid determinism of early Stoic dogma any more than the positivism of the Sophists. But he does accept the Stoic proposition that there is in nature an essential harmony directed by an immanent deity; and from there he proceeds to neo-Stoic views about the part played in history by what Vergil calls "omnipotent Fortune and ineluctable Fate," the Tyche of the Hellenistic historians.

Pliny's attitude emerges clearly in a well-known digression in his second book, in which he discourses on Fortune and Fate and seeks to reconcile the two by adducing the stock arguments of the neo-Stoics: "they attribute birth and death to Fate and everything in-between to Fortune." In the same passage he endorses neo-Stoic ethical determinism with its doctrine that wickedness will meet with its punishment inevitably, even if belatedly. Like the Stoics, he has a vision of the totality of all things, seen and unseen, a universe guided along its predestined course by the supreme intelligence.

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
 Whose body Nature is, and God the soul.

The pro-Roman bias and partiality, which cause him to regard Roman supremacy as inevitable, are hardly surprising in one thus influenced by Stoic ideas of pre<sup>553</sup>destination. And even the numerous passages dealing with prodigies and with the folklore surrounding animal omens may be more than a little due to neo-Stoic influence, since Panaetius, Posidonius and their fellows were convinced that divine communication took place via<sup>554</sup> auguries, dreams, oracles and the like.

Pliny could have acquired his Stoic complexion from the Quaestiones Naturales of Seneca which, as we have seen, was the probable inspiration<sup>555</sup> for his own great work. In any case, when Pliny was writing, Stoic theistic ideas were, so to speak, in the air and they harmonized with traditional Roman viewpoints: Lucan's Bellum Civile is redolent with them. But they also helped to keep Pliny from being an exceptional and unorthodox historian. The historical references to the period down to the death of Augustus reveal him as a very ordinary, conventional and commonplace writer on historical topics. Simply because he can be described in these terms for what he has to say on Roman history of the pre-Christian era, it does not of course necessarily follow that the same can be said of him as an historian of the Early<sup>556</sup> Empire. Nevertheless, it is possible to venture tentatively the conjecture that, had his more purely historical works survived, they would reveal that, for that period too, he was a typical kind of Roman historiographer.

The chronological order in which he wrote the lost works is recorded<sup>557</sup> by his nephew. Otherwise we know little about them.<sup>558</sup> But that little does seem to confirm what the historical references in the Historia Naturalis indicate. The lost works were evidently not lacking in accounts of prodigies<sup>559</sup> or in instances of the unusual and the curious. The Bella Germaniae actually

560  
 had its origin in a portent; moreover, it could scarcely have failed to  
 mention the omen of the bees at Arbalo (Reference 95). The A Fine Aufidi  
 561  
Bassi recorded portents affecting Nero. The trivia of the De Vita Pomponi  
 562  
Secundi included the one about Pomponius never belching. The Studiosus,  
 563  
 a work dealing with oratory, gravely informed its readers that Cicero  
 was always careful to have his toga fall to his heels to ensure that his  
 564  
 varicose veins remained hidden. The Bella Germaniae and the A Fine Aufidi  
Bassi respectively introduced such items as the longest day's journey on  
 record (Tiberius' 182 mile dash from Germany to the bedside of his ailing  
 565  
 brother Drusus) and a larch beam of remarkable size (ultimately used for  
 566  
 the construction of an amphitheatre).

Of course it is also the case that Pliny's non-extant works, like  
 his historical references in the Historia Naturalis, were packed with material  
 of the most significant kind. The De Vita Pomponi Secundi may even have  
 shed much-needed light on the Gracchi, since Pomponius owned autographs  
 567  
 of those republican worthies. Certainly the item in the same work about  
 568  
 the twelvefold rise in the price of Opimian wine between 121 BC and AD 39  
 suggests that the non-surviving writings of Pliny, like the historical refer-  
 ences in the Historia Naturalis, contained important information about Roman  
 economic history. Tacitus' tantalizing allusions to Pliny's twice mention-  
 569  
 ing the family of Germanicus in the Bella Germaniae and the A Fine Aufidi  
 570  
Bassi and to his account of the sacking of Cremona, the loyalty of Burrus  
 571  
 to Nero and the aims of Pisonian conspirators in the A Fine Aufidi Bassi  
 make the loss of these works a matter of keen regret.

It must of course be assumed that his methodology in his earlier  
 works differed from that which he adopted in the Historia Naturalis. In the  
 latter work, as has been noted, consultation of an assortment of authorities



was likely to be his practice for the most part only when he was dealing with natural phenomena; for historical references he was usually content to incorporate items taken directly from a single source, Varro more often than not. In the lost works his procedure must have been almost exactly the opposite. At any rate, however he treated any references to natural phenomena that he introduced into them, he presumably consulted a variety of sources, when occasion demanded, for his historical material, even though he may have relied primarily upon only one authority for any given portion of his narrative.

Even so, the historical material in the lost works, like the historical references in the Historia Naturalis, was sometimes uncritical and not always free from error. Suetonius is able to invoke the acta to convict Pliny of error in saying, presumably in the Bella Germaniae, that Gaius Caligula was born in the territory of the Treveri. Quintilian points out that Pliny was mistaken in the motive he assigned in the Studiosus for Cicero's way of wearing the toga. Tacitus dismissed the account in the A Fine Aufidi Bassi of what lay behind the Pisonian conspiracy as an absurdity.

Besides error there was also partiality, just as there is in the Historia Naturalis. In the latter work the partiality manifests itself in a pro-Italian colouring of the whole and in a strong pro-Flavian bias. In the lost works the partiality may have been of a different order. Presumably the De Vita Pomponi Secundi and the Bella Germaniae must have placed some emphasis on the Rhineland and proportionately less on Italy; and obviously works written before the Flavians came to power had to have other targets for praise than the emperors Vespasian and Titus. But that there were such objects of praise is certain. The De Vita Pomponi Secundi did not pretend

577

to be anything other than a eulogy of its subject, and there is no reason to suppose that, in the process, it did not have flattering things to say also about the subject's master, the emperor Claudius. Certainly, the family of Claudius, and therefore to some extent that emperor himself, formed the main theme of the Bella Germaniae:<sup>578</sup> it is most unlikely that praises of the emperor were not mixed in with the many complimentary things said about Drusus, Germanicus and Agrippina. Of course, the fact that the object of praise changed from Claudius in the Bella Germaniae to Vespasian and Titus in the Historia Naturalis does not mean that there was any essential difference in Pliny's approach to history. In the lost works, as in the surviving one, he was an historian from whom partiality was to be expected.<sup>579</sup> Ciaceri may well be correct in suggesting that Pliny was prone to adulation of the ruling emperor and that in the Historia Naturalis he both toned down the praise of Claudius he had shown in his earlier works<sup>580</sup> and also now dared to introduce more unflattering remarks about Nero (although it is only fair to note that, in the Historia Naturalis, there is little of the chronique scandaleuse so much to the fore in Suetonius and even in parts of Tacitus).<sup>581</sup> The remark of Tacitus about historians who out of either fear or flattery falsified the accounts of the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods may well have been directed against Pliny amongst others.<sup>582</sup>

This is not to accuse Pliny of calculating opportunism. It is possible that his behaviour is to be attributed simply to his acceptance of the principate; for unlike Lucan and Tacitus he seems to evince but little nostalgia for the Republic. His failure to publish the A Fine Aufidi Bassi, after he had finished writing it, is of some relevance in this connection.

As late as AD77, the A Fine Aufidi Bassi had not been issued to the public, even though it had long since been ready. Pliny's reason for the delay is interesting: he tells us that he did not want to be thought of as having made concessions to his own ambition. Ciaceri<sup>583</sup> interprets this as really<sup>584</sup> indicating a change of direction on Pliny's part with the advent of the Flavians, his praise of the immediately preceding emperors having now become out of date under the new dynasty. It may well be that Pliny was anxious to escape the charge of being subservient to the Flavian house. In any case an historian who accepted the system of the principate could hardly fail to praise individual emperors. Some expression of partiality was clearly inevitable.

It looks, then, as if the scattered information, which the Historia Naturalis supplies on the history of Rome down to AD14, does provide a fairly reliable picture of the kind of historian that Pliny was. Of course, as Syme has recently reminded us, an historian's approach to an earlier age may differ markedly from his method of treating contemporary events;<sup>585</sup> and it was largely with contemporary events that the non-extant, straight historical works of Pliny were concerned. It may well be that he dealt with times past in a rather more romantic and less realistic way than was his custom when describing the happenings of which he had himself been a witness.<sup>586</sup> Nevertheless, some of the same characteristics do emerge: the predilection for the abstruse and the unusual, the tendency to carelessness and consequent error, the bias in favour of certain persons.

In his preface to the Historia Naturalis, in which he makes his dedication to the emperor Titus, Pliny implies that the work is more valuable for its utilitas iuvandi than for its gratia placendi.<sup>587</sup> He suggests that its utilitas derives from the knowledge that is to be gained from a study of natural

history; and it can no doubt be argued that a description of natural phenomena, especially if it is punctuated with exempla drawn from Roman political, military and social history, could have a certain degree of utilitas for Romans. But it is undeniable that in their eyes it had much gratia placendi as well. They liked the Historia Naturalis.

Modern critics do not esteem Pliny very highly as a writer on natural phenomena: they berate him for his credulity, inaccuracy and unreliability. But the ancients seem to have had a much higher opinion of him. They regarded the Historia Naturalis as a handy compendium of knowledge. Good evidence of this is to be found in the many items of natural history excerpted from it by Solinus and later by Isidore of Seville, virtually verbatim and often accompanied by the same illustrative historical reference that Pliny himself had adduced. These borrowings are always made without any criticism at all of Pliny. Another, if more infrequent, borrower was Aulus Gellius. He too takes over for his own purposes whole sections from Pliny, usually without comment. On one occasion, however, Gellius does make an observation, and, so far as the present writer is aware, this is the only extant criticism by an ancient writer of any part of the Historia Naturalis. He remarks that in Book 28 of the Historia Naturalis Pliny records a large number of foolish and intolerable absurdities, giving them (falsely) on the authority of Democritus. Apart from this solitary reproof the Historia Naturalis does not appear to have met with strictures or disapprobation. On the contrary, it was enormously popular; the number of its surviving MSS is proof enough of that.

Pliny the historian, however, does not seem to have been quite as favourably regarded as Pliny the naturalist. It is significant that

the one ancient criticism levelled against the natural history portions of the Historia Naturalis is really directed against Pliny's historical methods, reproaching him for attributing statements to Democritus without checking to see whether Democritus had actually made them. <sup>591</sup> Certainly the lost works were nowhere <sup>now</sup> as popular as the Historia Naturalis. <sup>592</sup> The paucity of allusions to them and the apparently disparaging tenor of what few allusions there are do not encourage the belief that in ancient eyes Pliny was a really eminent historian. Quintilian does not even bother to mention him when discussing Aufidius Bassus, even though Pliny was the one who continued the latter's history. <sup>593</sup> Admittedly, the opinion of the ancients cannot be divined with complete certainty. But in the present state of our knowledge it does not seem to run counter to the view of Pliny that a study of his historical references has led us to formulate. On the contrary, it seems to provide some confirmation. He cannot be regarded as an historian who was concerned, like Polybius, to provide his readers with practical lessons in statesmanship. He did seek to edify them, from time to time, with reflections of a moralizing, Stoic kind; but, for the most part, no matter what he says in his preface <sup>594</sup> to the Historia Naturalis, his principal concern appears to have been to entertain, if not at times merely to divert the <sup>595</sup> reader. It would be grossly unfair, of course, to judge the Historia <sup>596</sup> Naturalis by Polybian standards of historiography. After all, the work does not profess to be a systematic history and could more accurately be <sup>597</sup> described as a collection of notes, many of them undigested. Only Pliny's avowed historical works should have the Polybian yardstick applied to them, and they regrettably have not survived. But, in theory, at any rate, Pliny satisfied the Polybian requirements for an historian: he was a writer who

not only read what his predecessors had written, but also travelled widely, participated in various aspects of life, and possessed personal knowledge of military and political affairs. <sup>598</sup> Unfortunately, the historical references in the Historia Naturalis do not permit us to determine to what extent in a work such as, say, the A Fine Aufidi Bassi Pliny measured up to the Polybian prescription completely.

Even so, it may not be wide of the mark to suggest that the historical references in the Historia Naturalis do, unconsciously and therefore accurately, reveal the working of its author's mind and his general outlook on matters historical. <sup>599</sup> And they suggest that his contribution to Roman historiography was not startlingly creative or notably original. He was <sup>600</sup> hard-working and indefatigable, and he purveys a vast and varied amount of information, of which but for him we should be completely ignorant. Nevertheless, he was no innovator: he did not introduce new fashions or explore fresh avenues for improving historiography. His nephew's pronouncement, that <sup>601</sup> he wrote with talent as well as industry, stems from affection rather than from discrimination. The more incisive Tacitus does not seem to have altogether shared the Younger Pliny's opinion. <sup>602</sup> Cornelius Tacitus used the Elder Pliny, but did not particularly esteem him. We can rest on Tacitus' judgment. <sup>603</sup>

## NOTES

### Chapter 1

1. Pliny Epp. 3.5.3-6.
2. Pliny Epp. 3.5.6.
3. Pliny HN Praef. 12-13, 21.52; cf. also 22.15 (Henceforth, in citing the Elder Pliny the letters HN will be omitted; his nephew, the Younger Pliny, will be cited as Epp.).
4. For example, at 7.2II Pliny tells us that Augustus never neglected to shave, at 14.88 that Romulus used milk and not wine for libations, and at 14.89 that in early Rome women were not allowed to drink wine.
5. Pliny 19.8.
6. Dio 53.19.2.
7. See Younger Pliny Epp. 5.8.
8. Pliny HN Praef. 12,17,28.
9. C.H. Herkert, Historical Commentary Drawn from the Natural History of Pliny the Elder for the Years 54-76 A.D., Unpublished Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1956; M.A.T. Burns, An Historical Commentary on the Reign of Augustus Based on the Evidence of Pliny the Elder Naturalis Historia, Unpublished Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1960; J.E. Rhen, A Historical Commentary on the Reign of Tiberius Based on the Evidence of the Historia Naturalis of Pliny the Elder, Unpublished Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1967.
10. It is surprising, however, that in these books the history of the individual communities is very rarely referred to, Pliny being content to list, as he himself puts it (3.2), "the bare names of the places". In this respect Strabo, another historian turned geographer, is much more informative.
11. Some of those that are found in later writers, however,

were undoubtedly taken from Pliny: eg. Aulus Gellius NA 17.15.6 (from Pliny 25.52), Solinus I.48-49 (from Pliny 7.147-50), Isidorus Orig. 16.16.6 (from Pliny 36.195).

12. Pliny 7.179 "naturae opera, non prodigia, consecramur".
13. Pliny perhaps did not regard it as remarkable that Books 33-37 should contain as many as 151 references: minerals are intimately associated with humans who covet them out of avarice (in the case of gold and silver) or vanity (in the case of bronze and marble statues).
14. One has only to think of the shattering impact on indigenous regimes and civilizations that the introduction of the horse into North America brought about.
15. Pliny 16.15,17.7,18.12,19.50 (= References 8,9,10,11, Chapter 2).
16. 33.14-16. (= Reference 15, Chapter 2).
17. 2.139. (= Reference 28, Chapter 3).
18. 15.2-3. (= Reference 31, Chapter 3).
19. 7.104-06. (= Reference 37, Chapter 3).
20. 33.55-6. (= Reference 45, Chapter 3).
21. 10.16 (= Reference 53, Chapter 4).
22. 28.148,33.20. (= Reference 58, Chapter 3).
23. 3.70. (= Reference 60, Chapter 3).
24. 13.84-7. (= Reference 42, Chapter 3).
25. 33.42-47. (= Reference 25, Chapter 2).
26. 33.17-18. (= Reference 22, Chapter 2).
27. 7.95-99. (=Reference 72, Chapter 4).
28. 7.91-94. (=Reference 78, Chapter 4).



29. 7.147-50. (= References 101, 106, Chapter 4).
30. 33.29-36. (= Reference 109, Chapter 4). Other excursuses that might be mentioned are: the family of the Caecilii Metelli (7.139-46), Mithridates (25.5-7), Cicero's villa at Puteoli called Academia (31.6-8), list of slaves who rose to eminence either through talent or crime (35.199-201), the great buildings of Rome (36.101-112).
31. Pliny 14.71 "nec ignoro multa praetermissa plerosque existimatos, quando suum cuique placet...".
32. An example is 3.106, where the words Caretini Supernates et Infernates, long dismissed as slightly puzzling but of little significance, have recently been shown by the discovery of an inscription to contain information of value for the siting of the town of Cluviae, the birthplace of Helvidius Priscus: see A. La Regina, "Le Iscrizioni Osche di Pietrabbondante e la Questione di Bovianum Vetus," Rheinisches Museum, 109 (1966), 260-68 and "Cluviae e il territorio Carecino," Rend. Accad. dei Lincei, 22 (1967), 87f., and cf. Tacitus Hist. 4.5. And, again, Pliny's reference at 3.61 to a (presumably Augustan) colonia at Puteoli has often been questioned (for example, by E.T. Salmon, Roman Colonization under the Republic, p.162), owing to Tacitus' record of a Neronian colonia there (Ann. 14.27); yet epigraphy has now proved Pliny right - there was an Augustan colonia at Puteoli: see C. Giordano, Rend. Accad. di Arch. di Napoli, N.S. 45 (1970), 219.

Chapter 2

33. Strabo 5.3.1, p. 228, 5.4.2, p.240 and Festus s.v. "Picena regio," 235L. On the custom of ver sacrum see Dion. Hal. 1.16, Livy 22.9-10, Festus s.v. "ver sacrum", 519L; E.T. Salmon, Samnium and the Samnites, pp. 35-36.
34. It may be noted that the following also originated from a ver sacrum: Samnites, Hirpini, Mamertini, Marsi, Marrucini, Sacrani: see W. Eisenhut in RE Bd. VIIIA1 (1955), s.v. "ver sacrum", cols. 919ff. See also T. Mommsen, History of Rome, I, p.163 and C. Letta, 1 Marsi e il Fucino nell'Antichità, p. 23f. All these occasions of ver sacrum are prior to historical times. The first example in historical times was effected by the Romans in 217 (Livy 22.9-10).
35. P. Bonvicini, "Il Piceno descritto da Plinio il Vecchio," RAL ser. VIII, 6 (1951), 18-19 sees no need to connect the descent of the Picentes from the Sabines with a ver sacrum.
36. Cf. E. Kornemann, RE Bd. XVIII. 1 (1939), s.v. "oppidum" cols. 708f.
37. Herodotus I.94, Dion. Hal. I.19, 27, Pliny 3.50.
38. For this war see Livy I.14, Dion. Hal. 2.53, 3.6, Plut. Rom. 17.23.
39. R.M. Ogilvie, A Commentary on Livy, Books I-5, p.81.
40. See F. Münzer in RE Bd. 8 (1913), s.v. "Hostilius" no.4, col. 2503. The coincidence between the fame of Hostus Hostilius ("quod Fidenam primus inrupisset" 16.II) and that of L. Hostilius Mancinus ("qui primus Carthaginem inruperat" 35.23) is striking.
41. See Livy I.12, Plut. Rom. 18. Hence Münzer, note 40 above and Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius, p. 171 was led to suggest that Pliny was here following the antiquarian tradition of Varro.
42. See Frontinus de aquaeduct. I.7, Plut. Coriol. I.I. It was extended to the Capitoline in 140 : Livy Oxyr. Per. 54. Cf. also S.B. Platner-T. Ashby, A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, s.v. "Aqua Marcia," pp. 24ff.

43. Platner-Ashby, Topographical Dictionary, s.v. "Aqua Tepula", pp. 27-8. Cf. also T. Ashby, The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome (edit. by I.A. Richmond), pp. 88ff, 159.
44. Livy I.33.9. Cf. also Auct. de vir. ill. 5.2.: "salinarum vectigal institui".
45. Cf. Ogilvie, op.cit. (note 39), pp. 139-40, with bibliography. Other ancient sources put the salt-pools at an even earlier date than Livy or Pliny: Dion. Hal. 2.55.5, 3.41.1-3.
46. Cf. Ogilvie, op.cit. (note 39), pp. 125-26.
47. Pliny 18.15.
48. The date of this Marcius is uncertain, being variously assigned to the middle of the 5th or 2nd centuries. See the discussion below under Reference 12.
49. One might likewise note Pliny's assigning to Ancus Marcius the building of the Aqua Marcia (cf. Reference 4), in fact built by another of the Marcii, Q. Marcius Rex. Likewise Pliny at 7.214 cites the benefaction of an horologium conferred by Q. Marcius Philippus in his censorship in 164 (cf. also Censorinus de die natal. 23).
50. Livy I.35.7 and Dion. Hal. 3.49 also record the capture of Apiolae but only Pliny names Valerius Antias as the source of the story.
51. Livy 1.35.7.
52. Livy I.38.7. Cf. also Pliny 35.157.
53. Livy I.38.7, 53.2-3. Cf. also Cicero de Rep. 2.44, Dion. Hal. 4.50, Livy I.55, Tac. Hist. 3.72. Elsewhere Pliny also records (7.69) that it was the spoils of Pometia (not of Apiolae) that were used for the Capitolium. Again, at 35.12 Pliny attributes a temple of Bellona to 495. It more probably belongs 200 years later (cf. W.V. Harris, Rome in Etruria and Umbria, p. 68). This might indicate how he could confuse the two Tarquins over the Capitolium.
54. Tac. Hist. 3.72.

55. Cf. also Dion. Hal. 5.31-2, 65.3 and Livy 2.13, 15 for further references to what may possibly be other terms of the same treaty. For the dire straits to which Por-sena's blockade reduced Rome cf. Dion. Hal. 5.32.1, 65.3, Livy 2.12.1, Plut. Public. 17.1. Cf. also B.G. Niebuhr, The History of Rome, I, p. 548 and nn. 1216 and 1217. See also Munzer, Beiträge, p. 232, and W.V. Harris, Rome in Etruria and Umbria, p. 28 and n. 4.
56. = Tabula VII. 10.
57. = Tabula VIII.II.
58. See C. Bruns, Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui<sup>7</sup>, p.31. Cf. also Servius, ad Eclog. 3.II;Gellius NA 16.10.8.
59. = Tabula VIII.9.
60. Gellius NA II.18.8.
61. Tabula VII.3a in Bruns, Fontes, VII.4a in Loeb edit.
62. Festus s.v. 'hortus', p.9IL seems to refer to this, although he does not actually mention the XII Tables: "hortus apud antiquos omnis villa dicebatur, quod ibi, qui arma capere possint, orientur."
63. Cf. L. Urlichs, Chrestomathia Pliniana, n. ad loc. "Marcius, wahrscheinlich nach der Hungersnoth 453 v.C., Dionys. 10,54; denn die Aedilen des J. 491 hiessen anders." Münzer in RE Bd. 14 (1930), s.v. "Marcius" no. 17, cols. 1544-45 likewise assigns him to the middle of the 5th century. T.R.S. Broughton assigns him to 440 (MRR I, ad ann.) In contrast, H.A. Grueber, Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum, I, p. 149f. puts the date in the middle of the second century, basing it upon a coin of ca. 124-103 bearing the legend "M. Marcius M.'f." with inter alia ears of grain depicted on each face. Cf. also Münzer, Beiträge, p. 270.
- The dating to the middle of the 5th century rests on the assumed chronological order of events (beginning with Marcius, in Pliny 18.15 where M'Marcus immediately precedes L. Minucius Augurinus who was eleventh tr. pleb.

in 439) and also on the fact, as Münzer in RE says, "dass damals Italien noch kein Getreide aus untertänigen Landschaften beziehen konnte" (cf. Pliny 18.15 ad init.).

64. See above, Reference 5.
65. As T. Mommsen, The History of Rome, I, p.426 says: "The statement that the two bulwarks of the Etruscan nation, Melpum and Veii, yielded on the same day, the former to the Celts, the latter to the Romans, may be merely a melancholy legend; but it at any rate involves a deep historical truth. The double assault from the north and from the south, and the fall of the two frontier strongholds, were the beginning of the end of the great Etruscan nation." See also H. Nissen, Italische Landeskunde, I, p.476, n.3, and F. Münzer, Beiträge, p.335. Cf. too G. Camporeale, "Melpo e Melfi," Studi Etruschi 29 (1961), 219-31. On dating by synchronizations see M. Sordi, "Sulla cronologia liviana del IV secolo," Helikon 5(1965), 3-44.
66. Livy 5.33, Dion.Hal. 13.10-11, Plut. Cam. 15-16.
67. Livy 5.33-35.3: Livy believes that this, the assault of ca. 390, was the first incursion of the Gauls into Italy proper (i.e. south of the Apennines). Pliny's words (12.5 "...hanc primum habuisse causam superfundendi se Italiae...") could be construed as agreeing with Livy but are really too ambiguous for certainty.
68. Justin 43.3.4ff.
69. Ogilvie, Comment. on Livy, p. 699.
70. O. Hirschfeld, "Timagenes und die gallische Wandersage," Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (1894), 345-347 connects the Livian version with a tradition as old as Cato (cf. Gellius NA 17.13.4 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus 13.10), and derives Pliny's version from Varro's antiquitates humanae (wrongly, in my opinion).  
Ogilvie, A Commentary on Livy, pp. 699-700 suggests that the version in Livy is a romantic explanation of events which should properly be dated to the 3rd century BC and not the 4th.

It is to be noted that while Livy connects the events concerning Clusium and the Gauls with the sack of Rome by the Gauls, Pliny's version does not. Luigi Clerici, "Un'antica leggenda (Helico e l'invasione dell'Italia)," Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte, 27 (1947), 250-54 suggests that Pliny's account derives from Posidonius and concerns events ca. 103-101BC connected with the invasion of the Cimbri and Teutones put down by Marius.

J. Gag , "Arruns de Clusium et l'appel aux Gaulois (?). A propos d'une tradition haruspicinale sur la vigne et l'olivier," Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, 143 (1953), 170-208 suggests that the story of Arruns and the Gauls as reported by Livy, Dionysius, Plutarch, and of Helico and the Gauls as reported by Pliny, is a misinterpretation of an ancient Etruscan haruspical tradition which gave to the vine and olive a role in the ritual of propitiation of bolts of lightning, and that Arruns was such a priest, in fact a Gallus (i.e., priest of Cybele?) ad p. 203; hence the formula "Gallos elicere" from the language of the haruspices has nothing to do with "Gauls" but signifies rather "fulgura condita elicere." Hence Gag  would emend Livy 5.33.3 "et invexisse in Galliam vinum inliciendae gentis causa Arruntem" to "eliciendae," and would see in the person of Helico an aetiological explanation of the cult of Jupiter Elicius (cf. Gr.  λιξ): cf. Ogilvie's comments ad loc.

71. T. Mommsen, R mische Forschungen, II. p.330 and n.75 says (re the disappearance of the gold in Pompey's consulship), "Dieser Stadtklatsch scheint Varro und andere Sp tere bewegen zu haben die alt berlieferte Zahl abzu ndern." See also Mommsen, Geschichte des r mischen M nzwesens, p. 400, n. 106.

Suetonius Div.Jul. 54 says that Caesar in his first consulship (59B.C.) stole 3000 lbs. of gold from the Capitol, replacing it with the same weight of gilded bronze. (Mommsen, M nzwesens, p.400, n.106 suggests that this story derived from Pompeian propaganda against Caesar).

Appian BC 2.41 says that Caesar, upon driving Pompey out of Italy, plundered the treasury despite the efforts of the tribune L. Metellus: "He took away money hitherto untouched, which, they say, had been deposited there long ago, at the time of the Gallic invasion, with a public curse upon anybody who should take it out except in case

of a war with the Gauls. Caesar said that he had subjected the Gauls completely and thus released the community from the curse". Cf. also Lucan Phars. 3.153ff.

It is possible that the recovery of the gold from the Gauls by Camillus and its being placed in the Treasury were the fabrication of a late legend to turn Rome's defeat into a victory: cf. Mommsen, History of Rome, I, p.430; A. Schwegler, Römische Geschichte, III. pp. 266-67, who quotes Livy 6.14.12-13; Ogilvie, Comment. on Livy, p.736. See also Schwegler, op.cit., pp. 268-69, who suggests a possible earlier version of the story in the fate of the Gauls who plundered Delphi.

Justin 43.5.8f. reports that Massilia sent gold and silver to help the Romans pay off the Gauls, whence they were granted "immunitas" and "foedus aequo iure." Also, the name of the town 'Pisaurum' (where Camillus is supposed to have caught up and defeated the fleeing Gauls) was fancifully derived by Servius (Comment. ad Aen. 6.825) from 'pendere' and 'aurum' -- the place where the gold was weighed out.

72. Hence, some of the gold may have originally belonged to the Gauls themselves. Cf. Varro ibid. "torques aureae". See also Münzer, Beiträge, p.223. T. Manlius obtained the cognomen 'Torquatus' from the gold necklace, torques, which he took from a Gaul whom he slew in single combat (361 B.C.).
73. Cf. Varro de Vita p.R. I, ap. Non. 338L.
74. Diodorus 14.116.7, Livy 5.48.8, Val. Max.5.6.8, Florus 1.7.17, Plut. Cam. 28.4, Orosius 2.19.9.
75. Varro de Vita p.R. I, ap. Non. 338L. T. Frank, An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, I, p.26. doubts that the amount of gold at that era could have been as much as 1000 lbs. let alone 2000.
76. Dion. Hal. 13.9 (13).
77. See Varro loc.cit. and Livy 5.50.6-7. For the story of the contribution by Roman matronae of their own gold, see Varro loc.cit., Diodorus 14.116.9, Livy 5.50.7, 6.4.2, 34.5.9 (where he cites another example of matronae contributing wealth to save the city), Val. Max. 5.6.8, Festus s.v.

"Matronis aurum redditum" 139L. Schwegler, op.cit. (note 65 above), p.268 suggests that the contribution of the matrons during the Gallic invasion may be simply a repetition of a similar story in connection with the capture of Veii a few years before.

78. Lucan Phars. 3.159.
79. Petronius Satyr. 88.9. It is possible that the version to which Petronius and Pliny adhere results from an early Imperial effort to rewrite certain aspects of early Roman history, just as Pliny and Tacitus did in connection with the capture of Rome by Porsena (cf. above, Reference 7).
80. This is confirmed, in part, by Publius Victor de regionibus urbis Romae ap. reg.octava: "signum Iovis Imperatoris a Praeneste devectum."
81. A.J. Toynbee, Hannibal's Legacy, I, pp.438ff. J. Beloch, Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt, p.342 believes that Pliny's census figure (in addition to the eight others which we possess prior to 390) is either a fabrication, or else that the figure cannot refer only to citizens capable of bearing arms but must rather mean the whole population of every age and sex, and even perhaps also Rome's allies. T. Frank, Econ.Survey, I, p.22 accepts Pliny's figures (cf. Toynbee, op.cit., pp.445-46 and his discussion of these views).
- The census mentioned by Pliny is said to have taken place, according to Dion.Hal. 1.74.5, in the second year before the taking of the city. Cf. contra, Festus s.v. "tributorum conlationem," 500L (see Münzer, Beiträge, p.224, n.2). See, too, P.A. Brunt, Italian Manpower, pp.27 n.1 and 113.
82. T. Frank, Econ. Survey, I, pp.232; 66-8, 79-81, 127-139, 228-31.
83. Pliny, it is true, seems to depend here for his figures on Sulla (perhaps his Memoirs) and Sulla never erred on the side of modesty (cf. below, at Reference 59). Nevertheless, although Sulla may have exaggerated the figures, Pliny must be right in suggesting that the amount of gold in Rome had increased many times since 390.



84. The date is based on Aeschines In Ctesiphontem 3.242. K. J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte<sup>2</sup>, III, p.598, n.1 disagrees with Livy 8.24.2f., who puts it in 326.
85. Cf. E. Pais, Storia della Sicilia, I, p.545, n.1; also Beloch, Gr. Gesch., III, p.595, n.4.
86. Strabo 6.1.5, p.256; also Livy 8.24.2ff., Justin 12.2.3f., the Souda s.v. "Τόρον".
87. Strabo 6.3.4, p.280, Plut. Agis 3, Athenaeus 12.536C-D. Cf. also Diodorus 16.62f., 88, Plut. Cam. 19.5, Pausanias 3.10.5.  
See also F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, pt. 2B, comm. on fr. 318 of Theopompus. Mardonia is usually identified with Manduria (cf. Livy 27.15.4 and H. Philipp in RE Bd. 14 (1930) s.v. "Mardonia", col. 1654 and "Manduria", col. 1046), called Μαυδύριον in Plut. Agis 3.
88. Cf. Pliny 16.14 (where he writes Trebia instead of Ticinus) and 26.19 (where he writes Pharsalia for Dyrrachium).
89. Diodorus 17.113 gives the date as 324/323.
90. E. Kornemann, "Die letzten Ziele der Politik Alexanders des Grossen," Klio, 16 (1920), 214 agrees with Arrian. H. Berve, Das Alexanderreich, I, p.326 disagrees with Arrian and accepts Cleitarchus. Cf. the discussion in F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, pt. 2B, comm. on fr. 31 of Cleitarchus, pp. 496-97: Jacoby rejects the view of Berve. Cf. also J. Kaerst, Geschichte des Hellenismus, I, p.509 and n.2: "Die Bezeugung kann nicht als eine sichere gelten, aber andererseits ist auch die Nachricht nicht ohne weiteres zu verwerfen."  
T. Mommsen, Hist. of Rome, I, p.491 dismisses the tale as a romantic fable invented by Cleitarchus, citing the silence of authoritative historians on the matter (e.g. Livy 9.18.6, Arrian Anabasis 7.15.6).  
L. Pearson, The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, p. 232f. also argues that there was no embassy. See also his reply in "Pliny, Nat. Hist. III, 57," Mnemosyne, 15 (1962), 46-7 to the review of his book (vide supra) by P. Brunt in History, 46 (1961), 116-17 and E. Badian in Gnomon, 33 (1961), 660-67, at 666-67. Badian in "The Date of Cleitarchus," PACA, 8 (1965), 5-11, at 10 accepts, though with some hesitation, Pliny's statement that Cleitarchus

recorded such a mission, but is uncertain whether the mission actually took place. J.R. Hamilton, "Cleitararchus and Aristobulus," Historia, 10 (1961), 448-58, at 454-55 rejects the historicity of the mission but thinks that it was, nonetheless, probably mentioned by Cleitararchus in his book.

W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, II, pp.21ff. believes that Cleitararchus was writing between 280 and 270, but that the story was invented after 180 and ascribed to Cleitararchus (whence it was picked up by Pliny). Tarn, p.23f., adduces other reasons, based on Ptolemy, for rejecting the historicity of the embassy.

91. Diodorus 17.113; cf. also Justin 12.13.1-2.
92. Arrian Anabasis 7.15.
93. Strabo 5.3.5, p.232. Cf. also the improbable account of relations between Rome and Alexander in Memnon of Heraclea Pontica (flor. after Caesar, but probably before Hadrian): Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, pt. 3B, s.v. "Memnon" (no. 434), fr. 18(2).
94. See T. Mommsen, Römische Forschungen, I, 92-4.
95. Q. Fabius Maximus Gurgus may also have been consul in 265: cf. T.R.S. Broughton, MRR, I, ad ann.
96. Prior to the disaster of the Cremera, the Fabii had been in a flourishing state: three brothers, Q. Fabius Vibulanus, K. Fabius Vibulanus, and M. Fabius Vibulanus had, between them, held seven successive consulships, 485-79. The disaster of the Cremera is reflected in the comparatively small part played by the Fabii in the political life of Rome between the years 477 and 360 when the first of the Fabii mentioned in the reference in question became consul: Q. Fabius Vibulanus (not the same as the Q. Fabius mentioned above) was consul in 467, 465, 459, praefectus urbi in 462, 458, legate in 458, decemvir consulari imperio legibus scribendis in 450; M. Fabius Vibulanus (not the same as the M. Fabius mentioned above) was possibly consul in 457; another M. Fabius Vibulanus was consul in 442, legate in 437, military tribune with consular power in 433, legate in 431; Q. Fabius Vibulanus was consul in 423,

military tribune with consular power in 416, 414, interrex in 413; Cn. Fabius Vibulanus was consul in 421, military tribune with consular power in 415, 407; K. Fabius Ambustus was quaestor in 409, military tribune with consular power in 404, 401, 395, 390, perhaps legate in 398, 391; N. Fabius Ambustus was military tribune with consular power in 406 and 390, legate in 391 and perhaps also in 398; Q. Fabius Ambustus was legate in 391 and military tribune with consular power in 390; a Fabius may have been military tribune with consular power in 387, in 383 and in 382; M. Fabius Ambustus was military tribune with consular power in 381, 369, and censor in 363 (he was not the same as the consul of 360).

97. Livy 8.38.1.
98. Cicero pro Planc. 8.20.
99. Act. Tr. Capit. s.v. 322B.C., Livy 8.40.1. Livy's main source (8.38-9) attributed the victory over the Samnites and the triumph to the Dictator (A. Cornelius Arvina); but other sources (8.40.1-3) attributed the victory and the triumph to the two consuls, and this is the version of Act.Tr.Capit.
100. Cf. Livy 8.37, Val.Max.9.10.1. It has puzzled some scholars how Fulvius could have passed so quickly from the highest office of the Tusculans to the highest office at Rome (as Pliny himself said at 7.136 with respect to Balbus the Elder, "primus externorum...usus illo honore quem maiores Latio quoque negaverunt."). It is possible that Pliny may have telescoped events a generation or more apart, and that the action by Fulvius against Tusculum has somehow been confused with an earlier conflict, such as the first war with Privernum in 357. It may have been at that time that Fulvius (or his father) went over to Rome, later to become consul. If this is the source of the mistake it is more likely that it was Pliny's source that was in error, for it is just this remarkable and novel achievement of Fulvius that is the point of Pliny's remark. See A. Schaefer, "Miscellen zur römischen Geschichte," in Commentationes Philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommseni (Berlin, 1877), pp.3-4; F. Münzer in RE Bd.7 (1912), s.v. "L. Fulvius Curvus", cols. 236-7, and T.R.S.

Broughton MRR I, p.150. The fact remains, however, that the Act.Tr.Capit. record no triumph over the Tusculans by L. Fulvius Curvus. Moreover, as G. de Sanctis says, Storia dei Romani, II, p.244, n.3, the chief magistrates of the Tusculans were not called consules, and "È probabile quindi che si tratti di una leggenda municipale diretta ad infamare il trasferirsi dei Fulvî da Tuscolo a Roma, leggenda che potrebbe aver qualche fondamento di vero se i Fulvî si erano stabiliti a Roma nel 381 o nel 338 e che poi, esagerando sempre più i fatti, si collegò col primo consolato d'un Fulvio." Of Pliny's account H.S. Jones in CAH, X, pp.547-48 accepts only Fulvius' consulship and his triumph over the Samnites as factual; the rest he rejects as "legend".

101. See Broughton MRR I, p.165.
102. Eg. Cicero Phil. 6.13.
103. In commenting on Pliny's words "bis devicerat", E. Pais, Storia Critica di Roma, IV, p.46, n.1 says "Da Plinio si ricava pertanto, che v'era una versione secondo la quale Marcio Tremulo non solo trionfò sugli Ernici, considerati come Sanniti, ma anche sui Sanniti contro i quali combattè allorchè accorse in aiuto del collega Cornelio." But Pais is wrong, for the Hernici were not considered as Samnites (though it is true that Tremulus' defeat of them occurred during the Second Samnite War). Cf. also E.T. Salmon, Samnium and the Samnites, p.248 and n.3. B.G. Niebuhr, The History of Rome, III, p.256 and n.446 suggests that the operations leading up to the destruction of 30,000 Samnites (Livy 9.43.8-17) can be described as one victory and the subsequent operations (Livy 9.43.17-21) as the second. Cf. also Münzer, Beiträge, p.289.
104. See also Livy 9.43.22.
105. Flavius is also said to have published a book, later known as Ius civile Flavianum, giving the formularies of the civil actions. Pliny may have omitted this as falling, in time, after the incident with the rings (which is the point of his excursus) mentioned in 33.18. Cf. F. Schulz, History of Roman Legal Science, p.9.
106. Cf. Mommsen, Rom. Forsch., I, p.97.

107. Doubt has been cast on the historicity of this statement: Praeneste did not have Roman citizenship, though some Praenestines were offered it and refused it as late as 216 (Livy 23.20.3). Anicius may have removed to Rome by himself and received the citizenship. Further, there had been no war between Rome and Praeneste since 338. Perhaps Anicius fought on the side of the Samnites, the Aequi or the Hernici: cf. Urlichs, Chrest. Plin., n.ad loc.
- See above (Reference 20) the curiously similar case of Lucius Fulvius, consul of the Tusculans, who came over to Rome where he also became consul (Pliny 7.136).
108. Son of Cn. Domitius Calvinus, consul 332 (RE Bd. 5 (1905) s.v. "Domitius", no. 42, col. 1419).
109. Sulpicius' praenomen was, pace Pliny, probably Publius: cf. Broughton, MRR, I, p.168.
110. Cf. Broughton, MRR, I, p.168, s.v. "Aediles, Curule", to which should be added Gellius NA 7.9.
111. Cf. Diodorus 20.36.6 (who, wrongly, places these events in 309) and Livy 9.46.4,10-11. Sextus Pomponius Dig. I.2.2. 7 (ap. Iurisprudentiae Antehadrianae Reliquiae I, Teubner edit., s.v. "Gnaeus Flavius") certainly errs in saying "Gnaeus Flavius scriba eius (i.e. Claudii)...subreptum librum populo tradidit." For a detailed discussion of some of the problems involved in Flavius' calendar, cf. A. Michels, The Calendar of the Roman Republic, pp.108-118, espec. on dies fasti, nefasti.
112. Son of M. Poetilius Libo, consul 314.
113. Livy 9.46.3ff.; so also Valerius Maximus 2.5.2.
114. Pomponius loc.cit. Cf. also Diodorus 20.36.6. Livy 9.46.1-2 records another version (besides the one that he takes from Macer) - "invenio in quibusdam annalibus" - which is closer to that of Pliny.
115. Pliny 33.18: "in antiquissimis...annalibus". Probably the annalist was L. Piso: cf. Gellius NA 7.9.1. See also Münzer, Beiträge, pp. 225ff.

116. See also Pomponius loc.cit.: "...et adeo gratum fuit id munus populo, ut tribunus plebis fieret et senator et aedilis curulis."
117. ap. Livy 9.46.3.
118. On this see W. Soltau, "Die Inschrift des Flavius," in Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 2 (1885), 1275-80, at 1278.
119. T. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht, I, p.498 and n.1. Broughton, MRR, I, p.167, 168 lists Flavius as tr.plebis in either 305 or 304. Macer's testimony may be doubted, as he says that, in addition to having held the office of tr.plebis, Flavius also had been triumvir nocturnus and triumvir coloniae deducendae; the office of triumvir nocturnus originated, it seems, only at a later date (ca.289): cf. Mommsen, St.-R., II, 594, n.4.
120. F. Schulz, Hist. Rom. Leg. Sci. p.10.
121. Livy Epit. 11.
122. Cf. Val. Max. 1.8.6; also Dion.Hal. 19.13.1, 16.3, 20.4.2, Livy Epit. 11, Strabo 6.1.13, p.263, Appian Bell. Samn. 7.1, Amm. Marc. 24.4.24.
123. Val.Max. 1.8.6.
124. So H.Le Bonniec in Budé edit. of Pliny ad loc. E. Pais, Storia Critica di Roma, IV, p.82, n.2 says Pliny doubled what was in reality a single event, and K.J. Beloch, Röm. Gesch., p.460 accuses Pliny of having inverted and then joined two distinct events, maintaining that the intervention of Aelius dated only from 269, though in his Griech.Gesch.<sup>2</sup>, IV, 1, p.545 he admitted Pliny's evidence.  
Cf. P. Wuilleumier, Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine, I, pp. 100-01 who accepts, with slight modification, Pliny's account.  
Münzer, Beiträge, p.232 suggests that Aelius' law was passed in 285 and that only in 282 as a result did Fabricius finally relieve the people of Thurii.
125. Cf. Fast.Tr.Capit. ad ann. 275 and his cognomen 'Caudinus'

in Fast.Cons.Capit. ad ann. 275.

126. Pliny 33.38.

127. The current tendency is to grant greater credence to Pliny than was the case a quarter of a century ago: see, for example, F. Catalli in F. Coarelli et al. (edd.), Roma Medio-Repubblicana, pp.33-39. Cf. also R. Thomsen, Early Roman Coinage, I, pp.19-20: "Only one coherent account of the origin and earliest history of the Roman coinage has been handed down from antiquity, namely in the great encyclopaedia of Pliny the Elder, the Naturalis Historia...In addition to the rather elaborate Plinian account, the historical, antiquarian, metrological, and remaining literature of antiquity contains a number of scattered details concerning the earliest Roman coinage, partly running parallel to, partly supplementing, and partly contradicting Pliny". Thomsen at pp.19ff. gives a complete collection of ancient literary testimonia.

128. See M.H. Crawford, Roman Republican Coin Hoards, passim.

129. Cf. C.H.V. Sutherland in The Oxford Classical Dictionary<sup>2</sup>, s.v. "Coinage, Roman", ad init. The Romans themselves were uncertain as to the origins of aes signatum: they suggested that the god Saturn first coined money at Rome, but this was merely an attempt to explain why the Roman treasury was housed in his temple (cf. Isidorus Orig. 16. 17). Some ancient authorities connected Numa with the introduction of coinage to Rome (cf. Thomsen, op.cit., I, pp.26-7). Among mortals, however, Servius is credited with first coining aes signatum, and this information is found only in Pliny (Pliny 18.17, 33.43. However, Charisius, Inst.gramm. I, p.105 Keil, says that Servius first coined nummus argenteus): neither Livy nor Dion. Hal. (though cf. Dion.Hal.4.15.4ff.) attributes it to Servius (to whom they attribute numerous other institutions), nor to anyone else for that matter. The archaeological evidence does not support the view that aes signatum is as old as Servius, but it does suggest that the oldest coins bore the marks of animals. It is likely that Varro was aware of this: in his etymological fashion he derived pecunia from pecus and probably found a remark in Timaeus attributing the origins of aes signatum

to Servius, and then collated the two items (cf. Varro de R.R.2.1.9 "et quod aes antiquissimum quod est flatum pecore est notatum" (cf. also Varro ap. Nonius Marcellus s.v. "verbecem" 278L). Cf. also Plut. Public. 11, Quaest. Rom. 41. It is interesting to note, however, that Thomsen in his eleven examples of aes signatum, op.cit., I, pp. 55-9 gives only one example of a pecus, viz. a bull. For the thesis that Pliny's excursus on coinage was probably taken from Varro, cf. G. Nenci in "Considerazioni sulla Storia della Monetazione Romana in Plinio (Nat. Hist. XXXIII 42-47)", Athenaeum, N.S. 46(1968), 3-36, esp.23, n.62); also Cf. Münzer, Beiträge, p.307. This would serve two purposes: to satisfy the ancients' desire to find a πρῶτος εὐρετής for every invention (cf. Pliny 7.191ff.) and at the same time to demonstrate that the Romans had lived, prior to the coining of gold in 217, uncorrupted for centuries, using simple bronze for their money from as far back as the times of King Servius (and, before that, using aes rude), and that even silver was not introduced until a fairly late date, viz. 269. (The real purpose of the excursus was to evoke an earlier and simpler kind of life). Pliny's statements about aes signatum and Servius, must, then, be rejected, though aes rude may have been used in the regal period (cf. Thomsen, op.cit., I, pp.28-31, III, pp. 257, 259).

130. The initial reduction of the as, however, to two ounces is supported by the numismatic evidence (Cf. Thomsen, op.cit., III, pp.263-65, Sutherland, op.cit.), with the qualification that, pace Pliny, the reduction took place in the Second and not in the First Punic War (Festus also puts the reduction in the Second Punic War: s.v. "Sextantari asses" 468L.) It may be possible to save Pliny, if one at 33.44 separates "primo" from "bello Punico", putting it in a sequence with "postea" and "mox" at 33.45-6. "bello Punico" could then refer to the Second Punic War: so Nenci, art.cit., 14-17. If one interprets Pliny strictly, however, the difficulty arises (not noticed by Nenci) that if the reduction of the as to one ounce occurred, as Pliny says, "Q.Fabio Maximo dictatore", i.e. 217, then the earlier reform, if occurring during the "bello Punico" (i.e. Second Punic War) must have taken place only the year before, in 218. Thomsen, op.cit., III, pp.264-65



does not interpret Pliny so strictly). Under the new revaluation of 217, it was enacted not only that asses of one ounce should be coined but also that the exchange value of the silver denarius should be 16 asses (having previously been 10 asses), but that, nevertheless, in the pay of soldiers, adds Pliny, one denarius has always been given for 10 asses: this is confirmed by the complaints of the soldiers in Pannonia after the death of Augustus in AD14: cf. Tac.Ann.1.17.8.

The final reduction, according to Pliny (33.46), occurred when by the lex Papiria asses weighing 1/2 ounce were struck. This is usually connected with the stress caused by the Social War and is attributed to the tr. plebis of 89, C. Papirius Carbo. This is recorded in no other literary source, but is supported by the numismatic evidence: such asses have been found bearing the inscription E.L.P. (e lege Papiria) and L.P.D.A.P. (lege Papiria de aere publico?) (Cf. T. Mommsen, Münzwesens, p.338f.; G.F. Hill, Historical Roman Coins, pp.89-91; Broughton, MRR, ad ann. 89; E.A. Sydenham, The Coinage of the Roman Republic, pp.95, 104.

131. Pliny is very exact in his dating of the first silver coinage in Rome: it was AUC 485, when Q. Ogulnius and C. Fabius were consuls, five years before the First Punic War - i.e. in 269. This tradition is apparently confirmed by Livy (at Epit.15). The event, however, is usually dated to 268, whereas Pliny's care to date the event exactly might argue in favour of accepting 269 as the correct year. Cf. Thomsen, op.cit., I, pp.33-4. (Charisius Inst.gramm. I, p.105 Keil says that Varro in his Annales (?) attributed the first silver coinage to Servius Tullius). The coins were the denarius (equivalent in value to 10 lbs. of bronze = 10 asses), the quinarius (or 1/2 denarius) and the sestertius (equivalent to 2 1/2 lbs. of bronze). The Romans had already introduced true coinage in bronze, i.e. aes grave, and then had instituted new magistrates for it, the Triumviri Monetales, traditionally ca.289 (Pomponius Dig. I.2.2.30f. Cf. Thomsen, op.cit., I, p.32, III, p.259). Pliny, interpreted correctly, is accurate here: the Romans did begin to issue silver coins in 269. In fact, however, the Romans had, prior to and during the course of the war against King Pyrrhus in S. Italy (280-275), broken with their

bronze tradition and issued the first two 'Romano-Campanian' didrachms of silver. They were Greek in workmanship and style and probably came from mints such as Naples or Tarentum. Their Mars/Horse's head and Apollo/Horse types were accompanied by the legend ROMANO. (cf. M.H. Crawford, Roman Republican Coin Hoards, Table 1). These were extraordinary issues, falling outside the sphere of activity of the Triumviri Monetales (who throughout the war continued to issue the ordinary aes grave). This extraordinary war-time measure became regular practice, when in 269, as reported by Pliny (and supported by Livy), the Triumviri Monetales began to issue at Rome itself silver coinage. This consisted of didrachms, with types Hercules/Wolf and twins, and the legend ROMANO. Pliny, however, is wrong in stating that it was the denarius that was the first silver coin issued at Rome (in 269). In fact, the numismatic evidence demonstrates that the first silver denarius was not issued at Rome until the time of the Second Punic War, ca.211 (cf. Thomsen, op.cit., II, pp.100ff., III, pp.261-64, Sutherland, op.cit.). It may be that Pliny, being more familiar with the denarius (the didrachm having been long superseded by it) and being aware of the tradition that silver coins were first issued in Rome in 269, mistakenly connected the one with the other (it should be noted that Livy Epit. 15 only says: "Tunc primum populus R. argento uti coepit". He does not, as does Pliny, specify the type of coin. Cf. E.A. Sydenham, op.cit., pp.xx-xxi.).

132. At 33.46 Pliny records that Livius Drusus when tr.plebis alloyed the silver with 1/8 part of bronze. This statement has puzzled commentators by its obscurity, whether it refers to Livius Drusus the Elder (tr.plebis in 122) or to his son (tr.plebis in 91). With respect to Drusus' action, the numismatic evidence lends it little support: for conflicting views, cf. T. Frank, Econ.Survey, I, p.266, Broughton, MRR, II ad ann.91, E.A. Sydenham, Coin. of Rom.Rep., p.xliv, H. Mattingly, Roman Coins, pp.20, 88. (The edict issued in 85 by the praetor Marius Gratidianus established an office to test and eliminate debased coins, and this gained him great popularity). This edict may be in response to the actions of Livius Drusus (or, as is more likely, counterfeiters). If so, it would argue that

it was the Drusus of 91 rather than his father of 122: Cicero de Off. 3.80, Pliny 33.132; cf. also Frank, Econ. Survey, I, pp.266-68, Broughton, MRR, II ad ann. 85. Sulla's action, upon his return, in throwing down the statues set up to Gratidianus suggest that (in addition to hitting at his enemy Gaius Marius, who was the uncle of Marius Gratidianus) he wished to affirm that the state coinage must be accepted at face value: cf. Pliny 34.27; see also Frank, Econ. Survey., I, pp.267-68; Münzer in RE Bd. 14 (1930), s.v. "Marius" no.42, cols. 1825-27. See Sydenham, op.cit p.xliv, who suggests that Drusus' act was never put into effect. So also M.H. Crawford, "The Edict of M.Marius Gratidianus," PCPhS N.S. 14 (1968), 1-4, at 3. Crawford also feels that Pliny's account of Gratidianus at HN 33.132 and Cicero's at de Off. 3.80 are irreconcilable: "If Pliny's account of Gratidianus is therefore rejected as a hopelessly confused record, a reasonable interpretation of Cicero's text is possible." There certainly does seem some discrepancy between the lex Cornelia de falsis of Sulla and the actions of Sulla as described at HN 34.27.

On the problem of the new 'victoriatus' (the original having been introduced ca. 213 (cf. Pliny 33.46 ? : "antea enim hic nummus ex Illyrico advectus mercis loco habebatur")) and the lex Clodia associated therewith, mentioned only by Pliny and usually dated to ca.105/104, see H. Mattingly, op.cit., pp. 19-20, who prefers to date it to the time of the reforms of Gaius Gracchus, 123-122; see also Sydenham, op.cit., pp.xxx, 80,81, who prefers the later date, as does Hill, op.cit., pp.37, 72-3 (though hesitantly).

Pliny's assertion (at 33.132) that M. Antony as triumvir debased the silver denarius with iron seems confirmed in the examples found of the legionary issues coined by Antony for the use of the navy and army previous to the battle of Actium (31BC): cf. Sydenham, op.cit., p.195 n. The usual practice was to debase with bronze (rather than iron): Pliny 33.46, 132. Cf. also A. Mongez, "Sur l'Emploi du Fer dans la Fabrication des Monnaies antiques," Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions, 9 (1831), 252-65; T. Mommsen, "Über den Verfall des römischen Münzwesens in der Kaiserzeit," Berichte über die Verhandlungen der k. sächs Ges. der Wissenschaft zu Leipzig, 3 (1851), 180-312, at 218-19; M. Grant, From Imperium

to Auctoritas, p.45.

133. At 33.47, after describing the advent of the bronze coinage (with its progressive reductions) and of silver coinage, Pliny, as he had hinted at 33.42, describes the origins of gold coinage at Rome. Unfortunately, the MS tradition here is confused: there are two branches, the Codex Bambergensis of the tenth century and the remaining manuscripts of later date, from the eleventh and following centuries, both groups giving different information as to the nature of the coin and the date it was first struck (cf. Thomsen, op.cit., I, p.20, II, pp.134-35, 243ff.). There is general agreement that, at least, the first gold coinage at Rome must have been issued at some time during the Second Punic War (and this is certainly supported by the evidence of the coins themselves), the two most probable dates being either ca.216 or ca.209 - Pliny himself putting it at 51 years after the first silver coinage, which, he says, was struck in 269): see Thomsen, op.cit., II, pp.305-06, and esp.306: "The conclusion must be drawn that the dilemma under discussion cannot be decided with absolute certainty, but that, on the basis of the above exposition, it seems to be most probable that Pliny's dating of the introduction of the gold coinage at Rome refers to the Oath scene gold of 216 B.C."; so also, apparently Sutherland, op.cit. and Crawford, op.cit., Table I.
134. Livy Epit. 15, Florus 1.14, Eutropius 2.16, Orosius 4.4.5. It is likely that these 360,000 formed the total inhabitants of Picenum rather than only the warriors, pace G. Speranza, Il Piceno dalle origini alla fine d'ogni sua autonomia sotto Augusto, I, p.217. See also in this connection P. Bonvicini, "Il Piceno descritto da Plinio il Vecchio," RAL, serie VIII, 6 (1951), 16-30, at 18, n.2.
135. Eutropius 2.16; Act.Tr.Capit.ad ann. 268.
136. H. Rackham in Loeb edit. of Pliny ad loc. For the treaty of 299, see Livy 10.10.12.
137. Strabo 5.4.13, p.251. See also B.G. Niebuhr, The History of Rome, III, pp.543-44 and T. Mommsen, History of Rome, I, p.527.

Chapter 3

138. See, however, W.V. Harris, Rome in Etruria And Umbria, p.117.
139. See H. Fuchs, Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom, pp.43-44.
140. Florus 1.16, Zonaras 8.7, Auctor de vir.ill. 36, John. Ant. in FHG 4.557, fr.50 (ed. C. Müller).
141. Cf. Florus 1.16 and Zonaras 8.7. Act.Tr.Capit.ad ann. 264 record a triumph by M.Fulvius Flaccus "de Vulsiniensibus". The Romans had attacked Volsinii in 265 under the consul Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges, who was killed in the fighting; the work was completed by the consul Flaccus in 264. An inscription (of the 3rd cent.B.C.?) recording Flaccus and his feat has recently been found in Rome (A. Degrassi in Bull.Com., 79 (1966), 91-93); and it also looks as if Flaccus did loot a lot of bronze statues (M. Torelli in Quad. dell'Ist. di Topografia, 5 (1968), 71).
142. It cannot be dated to 93, pace K.O. Müller, Die Etrusker 2<sup>2</sup>, p.169. He cites as his evidence Julius Obsequens 52, who, however, cannot be shown to be referring to the event described by Pliny. Cf. also A. Schneider, Le Premier Livre "Ad Nationes" de Tertullien, p.203, n.ad 1.9.7, and Budé edit. of Pliny, by J. Beaujeu, n.ad loc.
143. Pompey the Great's father was said to have died that way, whereas it was in fact plague that killed him (in 87): cf. Julius Obsequens 56a (Loeb edit.) and n.ad loc., Appian BC 1.312,366, Plut.Pomp.1.1, Granius Licinianus 35, p.22Fl., Orosius 5.19.18.
144. In this connection see Pliny 34.34.
145. Cf. Florus 1.18.5-6 who mentions the event and its date only.
146. Polybius 1.38.5f. speaks of a fleet of 220 ships got up against the Carthaginians in Sicily in 254 in only 3 months ("ὅπερ οὐδὲ πιστεύσαι ῥάδελον .") The relation, if any, of these ships to those mentioned by Pliny is uncertain: see the discussion in F. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, I, n.ad 1.38.5 and Münzer, Beiträge, p.203, who identifies, wrongly, in my opinion, the ref-

- erence in Pliny with that in Polybius, by suggesting that the words "contra Hieronem regem" were an error on Pliny's part.
147. Florus 1.18.5-7.
148. Livy 28.45.21.
149. = Peter HRR fr.29.
150. Frontinus Strat. 1.5.15, 4.5.10 reports that the doer of the deed in question is called Laberius by some and Q. Caedicius by others, but most writers call him Calpurnius Flamma. Our sources, with one exception, all give his name as Calpurnius Flamma: Livy Epit. 17,22.60.11, L. Ampelius 20.5, Pliny 22.11, Florus 1.18.13, Zonar. 8.12, Auctor de vir.ill. 39.3, Orosius 4.8.2. The single exception is Gellius NA 3.7.1ff., who, quoting from Cato's Origines, attributes the exploit to Q. Caedicius: and at 3.7.21 he states that Claudius Quadrigarius, in the third book of his Annales, says that the man's name was not Caedicius but Laberius. Cf. Münzer RE Bd.3 (1899). s.v. "Calpurnius" no.42, col.1373. See also V. Basanoff, "M. Calpurnius Flamma," Latomus, 10 (1951), 281-84.
151. See Pliny 22.6-8. Gellius NA 3.7.19 says that this military tribune, according to Cato (who calls him Caedicius), did not reap much renown for his noble deed. It is at least possible that Pliny inferred that Calpurnius won the corona graminea, not only because his deed corresponded with the conditions necessary to win the crown but also because another winner of this crown, P. Decius Mus, himself a military tribune, also won the crown in 343, and the sources closely associate Calpurnius with Decius Mus: Livy 22.60.11, Ampelius 20.6 (Pliny 22.9-10).
152. Cf. Fast.Tr.Capit.ad ann., and Pliny 8.16.
153. Pliny 15.2-3: he errs, as do also Suetonius Ti.3 and Florus 1.18.29, in giving Appius as the praenomen of the Claudius who was consul in 249; Pliny further errs in calling him Caeci nepos: he was rather, as the Fast.Capit.ad ann.249 show, P. Claudius Pulcher Ap.f.C.n. (i.e. son of Appius Claudius Caecus and grandson of C. Claudius Inregillensis): cf. RE Bd.3 (1899), s.v. "Claudius", no.304, cols.2857-8. See also espec. Münzer, Beiträge, p.269.

154. Cicero de Off.2.58. According to Cicero, the low prices set by M.Seius were designed to disarm the bitter and deep-seated prejudice of the people against him. See Pliny 18.16.
155. = Solinus 2.26; cf. Vergil Aen. 11.785ff. and Servius n. ad loc., Strabo 5.2.9, p.226, Silius Italicus Punica 5.175ff.
156. Vell. Pat. 1.14.8.
157. It must be admitted, however, that Livy Per. 20 also seems to give 241 as the date for Spoletium. Cicero pro Balbo 48 is inconclusive.
158. J.H. Corbett, "L. Metellus (Cos. 251, 247), Agrarian Commissioner?", CR, N.S. 20 (1970), 7-8 .
159. Gellius NA 3.18.4, who says that, according to Gavius Bassus, "Senatores...in veterum aetate, qui curulem magistratum gessissent, curru solitos honoris gratia in curiam vehi."
160. Livy 21.46, Macrobius Sat.1.11.26.
161. See E. Wölfflin, "Die Rettung Scipios am Tessin," Hermes, 23 (1888), 307-310, 479-480.
162. Most ancient sources place this event at the battle of the Ticinus River (cf. Wölfflin, op.cit., 307), but there are some who are more ambiguous: Polybius 10.3.3: περὶ τὸν Πάδον, Florus 1.22.10: "inter Padum atque Ticinum." Pliny is probably inaccurate here, though Appian Hannib.7 also places the action at the Trebia. Cf. Wölfflin, art.cit., 479 and Münzer, Beiträge, pp.228-9. See also F.W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius, II, pp.198-99, n. ad 10.3.3 who suggests an alternative to the view which I have expressed in the text.
163. Gellius NA 5.6.10. It is possible that Gellius could be interpreted less literally, in the sense "because he had relieved Rome of the intolerable pressure on it" ("quod urbem Romam obsidione hostium liberasset") -- in

which case it need not refer specifically to 211.

164. F. Münzer RE Bd.6(1909), s.v. "Fabius" no.116, col. 1829 is sceptical about this award and others ascribed to Fabius, and suggests that there are reminders therein of the awards to Augustus. See S. Weinstock, Divus Julius, pp. 148ff. Cf. n.316 below.
165. A denarius, depicting a horseman (perhaps a Gaul) in full gallop holding the head of a foe, was struck by M.Sergius Silus, quaestor between 99-94 B.C. and may be in honour of his illustrious ancestor: see F. Munzer in RE Zweite Reihe 2(1923), s.v. "M.Sergius Silus" no. 42, col.1720.
166. Livy 32.27.7, 28.2, 31.6, 33.24.4 (Livy's statement 33.21.9 that he was praetor peregrinus is probably an error).
167. Livy 32.27, 31, 33.21, 24.
168. So P. Groebe in W. Drumann - P.Groebe, Geschichte Roms<sup>2</sup>, V, p.411, n.4. But contra, see F. Münzer in RE Zweite Reihe 2(1923), s.v. "M.Sergius Silus", no. 40, col.1720 ad fin.
169. Münzer, Beiträge, p.194, n.1 suggests that the word collega be deleted. In fact, Pliny here has probably been guilty of simple carelessness.
170. So also Livy 29.14.8 (204BC). Pliny's account unfortunately omits the circumstances under which Scipio Nasica was thus chosen, i.e. the reception of the Magna Mater in Rome. For further references, see Münzer RE Bd. 4(1901), s.v. "Cornelius" no.350, col. 1495. He is often confused with his son P.Cornelius Scipio Corculum, ibid. no.353, col.1497. RE errs in confusing him with P.Cornelius Scipio Nasica Serapio, ibid., no.354, col.1504 ad fin. See Münzer, Beiträge, p.322f.
171. Val.Max.5.3.2e.
172. Livy 39.22.8-10.
173. Cf. Pliny 33.148. Livy says that Scipio raised money



from kings and cities of the East - which Mommsen does not believe: Römische Forschungen, II, p.466, n.96. Livy's words 39.22.10 "de iis(sc.ludis) post legationem demum in senatu actum" may contain some reference to the action of the populus Romanus mentioned by Pliny. Cf. Livy 25.12.14 for the religious aspect of ludi in honour of a god.

Pliny does give an earlier example of "stips" in the case of L.Minucius Augurinus in 438 (Pliny 18.15,34.21; see also Livy 4.16.2), but that was granted by the Senate (Dion.Hal.12.4.6). Pliny says that 186 was the first time when the "stips" was conferred by the populus and not the senatus.

174. This settlement had been begun in 186: Livy 39.22.6-7. See also Livy 39.45.6-7, 55.1-4, Zonaras 9.21.
175. Livy 39.55.4-6, Strabo 5.1.8, p.214.
176. Livy 40.34.2. A further reason for the establishment of the colony may have been the discovery of gold in that region, according to Polybius, in his own time: Polybius ap.Strabo 4.6.12, p.208.
177. Livy 40.29.
178. Val.Max.1.1.12.
179. Plut.Numa 22.
180. Festus s.v. "Numam Pompilium" 178L.
181. Lactantius Inst.Div.1.22.
182. Auctor de vir.ill. 3.2.
183. St. Augustine de Civ.Dei.7.34.
184. The phrase of Livy "in agro L.Petilii scribae" (followed by Val. Max.; Lactantius writes "in agro scribae Petilii") is usually interpreted as "on the land of Lucius Petilius, a public clerk". If L. Herrmann is right in "Ennius et les Livres de Numa, " Latomus, 5(1946), 87-90, at 88, the phrase should instead be interpreted as "on the land

of a/the public clerk<sup>of</sup> Petilius," 'Lucius' being emended to 'Quintus', i.e. the praetor urbanus of 181, Quintus Petilius, who, according to Pliny, ordered the books to be burned. The "scriba" could then be the Gnaeus Terentius mentioned by Pliny (St. Augustine omits the praenomen, calling him "Terentius quidam"; two MSS of de vir.ill. say "a Tarentino quodam"). On the "digging up" of Numa's books, see S. Weinstock, "Libri Fulgurales," PBSR 19 (1951), 143.

185. The fact of the "find" seems historically certain. Pliny, however, is attempting to refute Varro's claim (Pliny 13.69,84) that the discovery of paper was due to the victory of Alexander the Great when he founded Alexandria in Egypt. The discovery of Numa's books made of paper, then, would obviously confute Varro's contention. It seems likely, however, that the books did not go back to Numa (for a discussion of the reasons see A. Schwegler, Römische Geschichte, I, pp.566-67) but rather were the results of a recent fraud (Livy 40.29.6 "septenos... libros, non integros modo sed recentissima specie" - hence Pliny's special efforts at 13.86 to account for their remarkable state of preservation, his thesis depending on their authenticity), the object of the fraud being to prove the relationship between Numa and the Pythagoreans (cf. Livy 40.29.9 "mendacio probabili accommodata fide." So also Livy at 1.18 expresses doubt about the connection between Numa and Pythagoras). The attempt would seem credible enough at the time, since the relations between Numa and Pythagoras were accepted as true by the second century BC: the most ancient source, Cassius Hemina, believed in them (as did Piso and Antias). Now Hemina may have been a member of the Pythagorean sect (so J. André in his commentary in the Budé edition of Pliny, at 14.18, n.2, p.119). This, if true, would be of some importance for the question at hand (however, André offers no evidence to support his contention). See also A. Delatte, "Les doctrines pythagoriciennes des Livres de Numa," Bull.de l'Acad. roy. de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, 5<sup>e</sup> série, tome xxii (1936), 19-40; K. Latte, Römische Religionsgeschichte (Munich, 1960), pp.268-70; R. Ogilvie, Comment.on Livy, pp.88-91; E. von Lasaulx, "Über die Bücher des Königs Numa," Abhandlungen der

Philosophisch. Philolog. Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5(1847-49), 83-130. See also S. Dill, Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, p.564.

186. Cf. also Censorinus de die natali 17.11.
187. He had detected an inconsistency in Varro, whereby in one place in his voluminous works Varro had claimed that paper had not been used before the time of Alexander the Great (356-323) (HN 13.69) but had elsewhere in Book 7 of his humanae antiquitates stated that in the books of Numa (tradit. dates 715-673) there were 12 volumes of Matters Pontifical in Latin and 12 in Greek containing Doctrines of Philosophy (HN 13.87).
188. Cf. Broughton MRR I, p.423, n.6 and RE Bd. 2(1896), s.v. "Aufidius", no.5, cols. 2288-9; also Münzer, Beiträge, pp. 383-4. For fights including Africanæ (in addition to bears and elephants) in 169, see Livy 44.18.8.
189. Cicero Phil. 8.8.23, Livy 45.12.
190. Cf. Cicero Phil. 9.2.4. See also Münzer, Beiträge, p.294.
191. Cicero Phil. 9.2.4.
192. Cf. Münzer Beiträge p.294 who suggests, plausibly, that the confusion of Octavius with Popillius may have been deliberately arranged by Pliny's source (Verrius Flaccus, freedman and teacher of Augustus' grandsons) in order to put the activity of Augustus' ancestor (he was the first of the Octavii to be a consul, and to win a triumph) in a more favourable light.
193. Lucan Phars. 3.154-68.
194. Lucan Phars. 3.168. Cf. Plut. Caesar 35.3-4, Apophth. 206C, Appian BC 2.41, Dio 41.17. Cf. also Pliny 19.40. In his first consulship in 59 (Suet. Div. Jul. 54.3) Caesar had removed 3000 pounds of gold from the Capitol, replacing it with the same weight of gilded bronze. T. Frank, Econ. Survey, I, p.228 considers the figures given for 91 by Pliny to be corrupt. So also C.M. Bulst, "Cinnanum

- Tempus", Historia, 13(1964), 307-37, at 330.
195. = Peter HRR fr.38; see also Festus s.v. "religionis", p.358L.
196. Vell.Pat. 1.15.3.
197. Livy 39.6.7 (cf. Pliny 34.14 = L. Piso) chooses 187 as the turning-point; Polybius 31.25f. chooses 168; Sallust Bell.Cat.9-10, Bell.Jug.41.2 chooses the year 146. See D.C. Earl, The Political Thought of Sallust, pp.41ff. (esp.p.43 and n.4).
198. This may refer to such things as the suppression of the Bacchanalian "coniuratio" of 186. At least we know that Cato made a speech "de coniuratione" (cf. Festus s.v. "precem" 280L) which may possibly be related to this affair. A further connection may exist in a speech made by Cato as censor about L.Viturius: "Graeco ritu fiebantur Saturnalia" (cf. E. Malcovati ORF<sup>3</sup> fr.77). Moreover, we know that Cato's friend and fellow censor of 184, L.Valerius Flaccus, was one of the adsignatores of the S.C. de Bacchanalibus of 186: see Dessau ILS 18, line 2. Cf. also M.Gelzer, "Die Unterdrückung der Bacchanalien bei Livius, "Hermes, 71 (1936), 283-4. But the reference may be to something else, for example to the S.C. de philosophis et de rhetoribus Latinis of 161: Suet. de Rhetoribus 1, Gellius NA 15.11.1. Cf. also H. Scullard, Roman Politics, 220-150BC, p.147. For other instances of Cato's anti-Hellenism, see Pliny 29.14, Plut. Cat.Mai.22-3. See, also, especially Pliny 29.16.
199. See Polybius 3.59, 34.15.7.
200. F.W. Walbank, "The Geography of Polybius, "Classica et Mediaevalia, 9(1948), 160 dates the voyage to 146, after the fall of Carthage and prior to Polybius' return to Achaea. So also Walbank, Hist.Comment. on Polyb., I, note at 3.57-9, p.393.
201. See Pliny 6.199 and Polybius 16.29.
202. Cf. Urlichs, Chrest.Plin., n.ad loc.

203. Pliny errs in making Allobrogicus a brother of Scipio: he was a nephew. Or was it really Scipio's brother, and not Q.Fabius Allobrogicus, who possessed this wealth? See Münzer in RE Bd.6(1909), s.v. "Fabius" no.110, col. 1794, lines 42-9: as Münzer notes, "die Bezeichnung des Fabius als Q.Fabius Maximus Aemilianus bei Strab. IV 185, 191 und Appian Celt. 2 ist entstellt aus der als Aemiliani f." (cf. the designation "Q.Fabius Q.Aemiliani f.Q.n." in Act.Tr.Capit.ad ann. 120).
204. Diodorus 37.10.1. Dio 28, fr.96.2 points out that Drusus exceeded Caepio in wealth. See also Auctor de vir.ill. 66.1,5.
205. CIL I<sup>2</sup>, 652= Dessau ILS 8885. The relation between the inscription mentioned by Pliny and the one discovered near Aquileia is uncertain (cf. CIL I<sup>2</sup>, p.514). A.v. Premerstein, "Ein Elogium des C.Sempronius Tuditanus," Jahreshfte des österr. arch.Inst., 10(1907), 271 thinks that Pliny's inscription was originally part of Tuditanus' inscription (i.e. Dessau ILS 8885) and he makes the improbable suggestion (p.280) that the two inscriptions were identical and that originally there were two monuments, one at Aquileia and one among the Istrians. E. Reisch, "Die Statuenbasis des C.Sempronius Tuditanus," ibid., 11 (1908), 283 agrees with v.Premmerstein. Th.Birt, "Eine Siegesinschrift und geographische Karte des Tuditanus," Rhein.Mus., 73 (1920), 309 disagrees, saying that the two inscriptions do not belong together; so also Dessau ILS 8885, n.ad loc.

It is unlikely that Pliny saw this inscription which he quotes verbatim. He more probably got it directly or indirectly from the historical works of Tuditanus himself: cf. Peter HRR I<sup>2</sup>, pp.ccxf. Tuditanus is quoted as a source in the Index of Books 12-13.

Part of the elogium of Tuditanus has been found, but it does not seem to mention Pliny's Histri or the Iapydes of Livy Epit. 59: cf. L'Année Épigraphique 1953, no.95 and Inscriptiones Italiae XIII, fasc.3, 73ff.= no. 90.

Once again Pliny is careless (unless his text is corrupt): his M stadia is absurd: it should be MM stadia, and his text is usually so emended (eg. by Detlefsen).

See also A. Stein, Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur, pp.61-2.

For Tuditanus' exploits in the north of Italy see Livy Epit.59, Appian Ill. 10, BC 1.18-19, Act.Tr.Capit.

206. Plut. C.Gracchus 4.3

207. Dio 66.24.

208. See CIL VI, 10043.

209. The MSS read "nostra aetas", i.e. AD 23-77, unless the words have been thoughtlessly repeated by Pliny from his source. According to Münzer, Beiträge, p.178,n.1, Hirschfeld emended "nostra" to "postera". This may be right. Such a sacrifice would contravene the decree of 97BC. Moreover, one would have expected Pliny, ever prone to moralizing, to have commented with some pointed remark, had such an occurrence happened in his own lifetime. Such an event would have been unlikely to have happened under Tiberius, who abolished human sacrifice among the Druids (Pliny 30.13, pace Suetonius Cl.25 who claims it was Claudius: cf. R. Syme, Tacitus, I, p.457, n.6). The event is also unlikely to have occurred under Claudius (pace Syme, Tacitus, I, p.458, n.1: cf. Pliny 29.54) or, again, under Nero (cf. the actions taken by his general Suetonius Paulinus against the Druids on the island of Mona in AD60: Tac.Ann.14.29-30). If Pliny did write "nostra", then he did so in error, possibly thinking of the curious incident where the Emperor Gaius (Suet.Cal.29.2) put to death several Gauls and Greeks in a body, boasting that he had thereby subdued Gallograecia; see C.Cichorius, Römische Studien, pp.13-14.

210. Dion.Hal. 2.69, Valerius Maximus 8.1.5, Tertullian Apol. 22, St. Augustine de Civ.Dei 10.16.

211. So C. Cichorius, Röm.Stud., pp.7-21. Cf. Also Boehm in RE Bd.7 (1912), s.v. "Gallus et Galla, Graecus et Graeca," cols. 683-687, and Schwenn in RE Bd. 15 (1932), s.v. "Menschenopfer," cols. 954-956. The rite seems to have involved the expiation of a "prodigium": see Livy 22.57.4 and Pliny 30.12 "...prodigiosa...", and also

F.Luterbacher, Der Prodigien Glaube und Prodigienstil der Römer, p.40.

Tzetzes confusedly says that the Greeks sacrificed not two Greeks and two Gauls but a Greek and a Gaul ἀνδρογόυονov : cf. Luterbacher, ibid., p.25 and Boehm, ibid., col. 685.

212. Plut. Marcel. 3, Dio ap.Tzetzes in Lycophr. Alex. 603 = Zonaras 8.19, Orosius 4.13.3 (who wrongly gives 237 instead of 230 as the date for Hamilcar's death); cf. also Livy Epit.20. The rite does not seem to have been Roman in origin: Livy 22.57.6 "minime Romano sacro" and Orosius 4.13.3 "consuetudinem priscae superstitionis egressi", and Cicero pro Font. 14.31. Cf. also Minucius Felix Oct.30.4.
213. Livy 22.57.6; cf. Plut. Marcel. 3.4.
214. Plut. Quaest.Rom.83; also Livy Epit.63, Obsequens 37 (Loeb edit.), Orosius 5.15.20-22, Dio 26, fr.87.
215. Plut. Quaest.Rom.83.
216. The statement in Plut. Marcel. 3.4 ad fin. and Pliny's use of "solet" in 28.12 are inexplicit, hinting at a continuation into the first century AD of this practice. So also the fact that the prayer used at this ceremony of immolation was dictated by the Master of the collegium of XV viri (which collegium consisted of ten up until Sulla's reform) suggests that the ceremony continued even after the senatus consultum of 97: see Munzer, Beiträge, p.178. Other human sacrifices, though not of the type recorded by Pliny (i.e. of Gauls and Greeks) and not sanctioned officially by the state, are also recorded subsequent to the decree of 97: there was a rumour circulating that in 63, at the instigation of Catiline, the Catilinarian conspirators had sacrificed a boy and, after administering the oath over his vitals, ate them (Sallust Bell.Cat.22, Plut. Cic.10, Dio 37.30.3). Likewise, Dio (43.24.4) records that Julius Caesar in 46, after executing a riotous citizen (the executed man, it must be noted, was not a sacrifice: Dio says that he was punished), had two others slain (i.e. not buried alive) as a sort of ritual observance, in the Campus

Martius (not the Forum Boarium), and that the Sibyl made no utterance (contrary to usual practice). For the "sacrifice" conducted in 41 by Octavian at Perugia, see Seneca de clem. 1.11, Suet. Aug. 15, Dio 48.14. Cf. also Urlichs, Chrest. Plin. n. ad HN 30.12.

217. Festus 135, 297, 298L, Vegetius Epitoma rei militaris 3.6.
218. Sallust Bell. Cat. 59.3
219. Cic. de div. 1.47.106, Plut. Marius 36. See also J. Hubaux-M. Leroy, "Le mythe du phénix, "in Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. 82 (1939), at 216-21.
220. Appian BC 2.96.
221. For the archaeological evidence see A. Reinach in: Daremberg et Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines, IV, s.v. "Signa militaria", pp. 1309ff. Cf. C. Caprino et al., La Colonna di Marco Aurelio, p. 70f. See also H.M.D. Parker, The Roman Legions, pp. 36ff., and G.R. Watson, The Roman Soldier, pp. 128-29. Livy 26.48.12 (210BC) speaks anachronistically of soldiers swearing (at the siege of Carthago Nova) by their "signa militaria et aquilas" (cf. also Livy 27.13).
222. Cf. G.R. Watson, The Roman Soldier, pp. 114-16.
223. Strabo 5.2.6, p. 223.
224. Pliny 34.139. Cf. T. Frank, An Economic History of Rome, p. 233, n. 14 and An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, I, "Rome and Italy of the Republic," pp. 263-64. Cf. also P.A. Brunt, "The Equites in the Late Republic," Second International Conference of Economic History, Aix-en-Provence, 1962, vol. I, Trade and Politics in the Ancient World, 140-151 (Now reprinted in R. Seager (ed.) The Crisis of the Roman Republic (Cambridge, Heffer, 1969), pp. 83-129). See also W.V. Harris, Rome in Etruria and Umbria, p. 110 n. 7.
225. Cf. n. ad loc. in K. Jex-Blake and E. Sellers, The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art. It is possible that he was a freedman of the consul of 125 Marcus Plautius Hypsaeus (who himself may have held a position in Asia),



- in which case he would surely have been a Roman citizen. See F. Munzer, Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien, p.42, n.1 and RE Bd. XXI.1 (1951) s.v. "Plautius", no.21 col.15 and no.24 cols. 18-19. One can also cite the case of the Antioch-born poet A.Licinius Archias: in 93 through the influence of L.Licinius Lucullus he obtained the local citizenship of Heraclea, a civitas foederata in Lucania (where Lucullus was living in exile after his mismanagement of the Sicilian slave war). When Heraclea became "Roman" as a result of the Social War, Archias obtained the Roman citizenship: see Cicero pro Archia 4.7 ff.; cf. also W.Drumann-P.Groebe, Geschichte Roms<sup>2</sup>, IV, p.215, n.1. See C.Cichorius, "zu römischen Malern," RhM, 76(1927), 325-26.
226. M. Herennius may possibly be related to L. Herennius, the banker from Lepcis, who was put to death by C. Verres in Syracuse, ca.73-71: Cicero II in Verr. 1.5.14, 5.59. 155-5. 60.156.
227. See Pliny 35.56. Pliny notes here (19.38-40) the scarcity of silphium from Cyrene in his own day. So also Scribonius Largus, writing before AD 50, says "laser Cyrenaicum, si poterit inveniri" (Compositiones 67).
228. The date of the quarrel between Drusus and Caepio is uncertain. E. Badian puts it ca.95, rejecting Münzer's suggestion of ca.103: see Badian's "Caepio and Norbanus" in Studies in Greek and Roman History, pp.34-70, esp.40-42. Cf. also I. Haug, "Der römische Bundesgenossenkrieg 91-88 v.Chr.bei Titus Livius," WJA 2(1947), 100-139.
229. Pliny 25.52. He errs in calling Anticyra an island. The error is repeated by Gellius NA 17.15.6.
230. Auctor de vir.ill. 66.11.
231. With respect to the drinking of goat's blood, see Hippocrates περί ἰερίης νόσου 2, who refers to the common belief that the goat was in some way connected with epilepsy and hence to be avoided. Celsus de Medicina 3.23.7 refers to an attempted cure of epilepsy by the drinking of the hot blood from the cut throat of a gladiator (see also Pliny 28.43).
232. Cf. Cicero Orator 213-214, Livy Epit. 71, Seneca de brev. vit. 6.1, Pliny 25.52, Florus 2.5.9.

233. For their private quarrel see also Cicero de domo sua 120, Ampelius 26.4, Florus 2.5.4, Dio 28, fr. 96.1-3.
234. So too Decius Mus had won the corona graminea for his part in the victory against the Samnites in 343 (Livy 7.37). See E.T. Salmon, Samnium and the Samnites, p.367, n.1; Münzer, Beiträge, p.157 and S. Weinstock, Divus Julius, p.149.
235. Cf. Livy 7.37.2, Pliny 22.7. Pliny, in his list, does not include Julius Caesar, who also won the corona graminea (or obsidionalis: Pliny 22.7): cf. Weinstock, Divus Julius, pp.148ff. In fact, at the end of his list of winners Pliny says (22.13): "nec praeterea quemquam hac invenimus donatum". On Sulla, cf. Weinstock, ibid., p.149.
236. See E.T. Salmon, Samnium and the Samnites, pp.366ff. Nola, in fact, held out against Sulla until 80. See Weinstock, Divus Julius, p.149. See also I. Calabi, "I Commentarii di Silla come fonte storica," Mem. Acc. Naz. Lincei, VIII, 3 (1950/1951), 278-9. B. Scardigli, "A proposito di due passi su Sertorio," Atene e Roma, 15 (1970) 174-81, at 174-176.
237. Cicero pro Sulla 21.60-62, Vell.Pat. 2.16, Orosius 5.18.22.
238. Appian BC 1.42.
239. Vell.Pat.2.65.3.
240. Val.Max.6.9.9. See Münzer, Beiträge, p.401.
241. Gellius NA 15.4.
242. H. Gundel in RE Bd.8(1913) s.v. "Ventidius", no.5, col. 797 speaks of Masurius Sabinus' statement: "...wohl als irrtümlich anzusprechen ist"; but this only evades the problem.
243. Dio 43.51.
244. It is difficult to appreciate the relevance of the words "Antiocho rege Asiaque devictis urbis anno DLXV"

which directly precede the censorial edict. Despite H. Rackam in the Loeb edit and Solinus 46.2, who connect them with the censor's edict of 89BC, the words "urbis anno DLXV (=189BC)" certainly go with what precedes rather than with what follows, unless one follows Münzer, Beiträge, p.124, who reads "DCLXV" (=89BC) and refers the number to what follows (cf. Pliny 14.95). This, however, does not establish the relevance of the reference to Antiochus (But cf. Münzer, ibid, whose explanation of the connection may be correct.)

245. Lucilius ap. Gellius NA 2.24.10. It is possible, however, that Lucilius may be referring to L.Licinius Crassus, who was tr.plebis in 107 (and censor in 92) and is mentioned in Book 20 of Lucilius (cf. Broughton MRR ad ann.107), though if he was responsible for this popular Lex Licinia it seems unlikely that Cicero would have called his tribunate "tacitum" (Brut.160) or that Lucilius would have referred to him as he did (Warmington, Remains of Old Latin, vol.3, p.186 (Loeb edit.)). P. Licinius Crassus may have been aedile in 102 (cf. Broughton ad ann.102). This Lex Licinia was so much approved of that a decree of the Senate ordered it to take effect immediately after its publication and before it had actually been passed by the People (Macrob. Sat. 3.17.7). It was abolished by the proposal of M.Duronius in 98 (or 97) (Val.Max.2.9.5). See F. Münzer in RE Bd. XIII (1926), s.v."Licinius (Crassus)", no. 61, cols. 287-90. For a view on the historical significance of these censorial edicts (Pliny 13.24, 14.95), see Budé edit., n. ad 14.95, pp.123-24.

Chapter 4

246. See Gellius NA 1.12.16-17.
247. Pliny may have simply lifted the words "ad hoc aevi" from his source without making the necessary changes: so also at 18.32 he says "novissimus (italics mine) villam in Misenensi posuit Marius VII cos." Cf. also "ad hoc aevi" at 16.7.
248. F. Münzer RE Bd. 3 (1899) s.v. "Caelius", no. 35, col. 1266. See also G.V. Sumner, "The Lex Annalis under Caesar," Phoenix, 25 (1971), 247-48.
249. Cf. T. Frank, Econ. Survey, I, pp.232,297.
250. Unless this refers to Pompey's refusal to look at Sertorius' papers, which he is said to have burned unread: Plut. Pomp.20.
251. Sallust Hist.fr.89M, Strabo 3.4.1, p.156, 3.4.7, p.159, Servius ad Aen. 11.6. See also A. Stein, Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur, p.31.
252. Festus s.v. "navali corona" 156L apparently refers to this, (since the corona rostrata was also called navalis), but the text is defective and seems to have been reconstructed from Pliny by the editor: Münzer, Beiträge, p.277, and n.1. For Varro's service in the Pirate War, see Varro de re rustica 2, praefat., Pliny 3.101, Appian Mithr. 95.
253. Livy Epit. 129, Vergil Aen. 8.683-84, Ovid Ars Amat. 3.392, Vell.Pat. 2.81.3, Seneca de benefic. 3.32, Dio 49.14.3.
254. Cf. Pliny 22.12.
255. See the discussion in Münzer, Beiträge, p.277, who suggests that the contradiction between Pliny's claim and that of Livy and Velleius may in part be attributed to their having failed to notice the award in Varro's writings, because as he says, "Varros Ruhm schon den unter Augustus und Tiberius schreibenden Historikern unbekannt war" - but this seems improbable.

256. Solinus 19.4, in saying that Pompey himself went to the Bactrians, misinterprets Pliny.
257. In other words, he was about the same age as Augustus. That Agrippa died in 12, we know from Dio 54.28. M. Reinhold, Marcus Agrippa, a biography, pp.1-4 argues, contrary to most scholars, that Pliny's words mean Agrippa was born in 64 (rather than 63). If one accepts Reinhold's translation (p.12) of "misera iuventa", which he separates from the preceding "adversa pedum valitudine" (at Pliny 7.45), then we also have some additional information, nowhere else recorded, about Agrippa's early life.
258. Plut. Pomp.45.3, Appian Mithr. 116.
259. Plut. Pomp. 45.3.
260. Livy 45.40.1.
261. T. Frank, Econ. Survey, I, p.137 fails to take this addition into account.
262. Pliny 33.56. See Vell. Pat. 2.40.3 who specifically states that Paulus paid more into the aerarium than Pompey.
263. Pliny supplies additional details about Pompey's triumph at 8.4, 12.20, 111, 33.151, 37.12f., 18.
264. Vell.Pat.2.40.3, Plut.Pomp.45, Appian Mithr. 116f.
265. Plut.Pomp.45.
266. Appian Mithr.116f.
267. Cf. Pliny 7.98, 37.13. We know from other sources at least the approximate date of the triumph, for various authors record that Pompey died either on his birthday or on the day before or after it: Vell.Pat.2.53.3, Plut. Pomp.79.2, Cam. 19, Quaest.Conv. 8.1.1, Dio 42.5.5.
268. A structure otherwise unattested. See S. Platner and T. Ashby, A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, p.343 s.v. "Minerva, Delubrum".

269. Diodorus Siculus 40.4.
270. See Act.Tr.Capit.ad ann., where, however, there is another lacuna; but cf. Eutropius 6.16 who gives the mistaken date 64.
271. Vell.Pat. 2.34.2,40.5, Florus 1.42.6.
272. Cf. Dio 36.19.3 where we are told that Metellus captured Crete, but was unable to have its leaders Panares and Lasthenes, whom he had also captured, march in triumph, for Pompey got them away beforehand by persuading one of the tribunes that it was to him they had submitted in the settlement and not to Metellus. See also Vell.Pat. 2.34.2,40.5, Florus 1.42.6.
273. Plut.Caes.5.4. See also Sallust Bell.Cat.49.3 and Appian BC 2.1.
274. Comm.de aere alieno Milonis, ed.Hildebrandt, p.151.
275. Cicero says that Milo spent tria patrimonia on games and gladiators: pro Mil.95, Asc.p.27,47, ad fam.2.6.3. See also Cicero ad Q.fr.3.9.2 (end of 54BC), who refers to the games Milo intended to give, which would cost one million sesterces (ie. in order to further his chances of being elected consul); see also ad Q.fr. 3.8.6: "He is preparing to give the most magnificent games, at a cost, I assure you, that has never been exceeded by anyone".
- It is possible that the MS reading of Pliny is wrong (see the app.crit. in Teubner edit.) and that the text should read not 70 but 7 million sesterces. If so, the amount would be very close to the 6 million sesterces in the Schol.Bob. However, Pliny does say Milo's debt was "inter prodigia animi humani", which suggests that Pliny read 70 not 7 million (the former being over twice the amount of Caesar's debt, and Caesar was notorious for the amount of debt he had accumulated in his rise to political power).
276. See A.W. Lintott, Violence in Republican Rome, pp.122-23. Cf. also Münzer, Beiträge, p.232, n.1.
277. See Cic.de orat. 2.283 for Scaurus' greed.Sallust, as

is well known, reports Scaurus, i.e. Scaurus père (along with Bestia), in Bell.Jug.15 as having received bribes from Jugurtha. See Urlichs, Chrest.Plin., n.ad loc. and Münzer, Beiträge, p.330; also T. Frank, Econ. Survey, I, pp.398ff.

278. Caesar BC 3.48.
279. Suetonius Div.Jul.68.
280. Appian BC 2.61.
281. Dio 41.51.1.
282. Pliny 19.144.
283. Münzer, Beiträge, p.126.
284. Horace Carm. 3.5.9.
285. Appian BC 1.41.
286. Plut.Crass.6, Sulla 29.
287. Livy Epit.97, Plut.Crass.10f., Appian BC 1.118-20, Orosius 5.24.
288. Solinus 1.106-107.
289. Plut.Caes.15.3. Velleius 2.47.1 says that Caesar slew "more than 400,000 of the enemy". Pliny's remark at 7.92 ad fin., that Caesar did not publish the casualties of the Civil Wars, is curious, for, as Münzer, Beiträge, p.128 notes, he did in fact do so: eg. Caesar BC 3.99.
290. Dio 47.11.4 (=43BC) recounts this story with no variation from Pliny's version. He may well have derived it from Pliny. However, he calls the person involved "L.Philus-cius", but this seems an error: see Münzer in RE Bd.6 (1909), s.v. "Fidustius" no.1, col.2316.
291. Seneca Suas.6.3,24.
292. Lactantius Inst.Div.2.4.33.37.

293. So also Octavian is supposed to have proscribed men for a similar reason: Suet.Aug.70.
294. Pliny is inaccurate again: he says Cicero procured Verres' condemnation. In fact, Verres avoided condemnation by going into exile voluntarily.
295. Dio 48.32.2. See also Cicero pro Balb.8.19. Cf. R. Syme, The Roman Revolution, p.50lf.
296. Pliny 5.36.
297. Suet. Galb. 1.
298. Dio 48.52; cf. also 63.29.3.
299. Cf. Urlichs, Chrest.Plin., p.199 and F. Münzer, Beit-räge, p.121 who notes (referring to Urlichs) that Pliny's version differs in two respects from those of Suetonius and Dio: first, the historians describe the happening differently, and secondly (and more important) the historians say that the grove had died in Nero's last year and this provided a sign of his impending downfall, whereas Pliny regards the grove as still extant. And see, curiously, Pliny 17.5 ad fin. The contradiction, says Münzer, can only be explained by the fact that Pliny in his Historia Naturalis used an older source than did the historians. This is further confirmed by Pliny's habit of carelessly taking over from his sources words which make no allowance for the time-interval between the event in question and the composition of Pliny's work: cf. Münzer, ibid., p.38, n.1, p.60, n.1.
- Pliny dates the event to the period when Livia had been betrothed to Octavian (she married him 17 Jan. 38); Suetonius records it as occurring immediately after the marriage; Dio places the event in 37.
300. See Pliny 15.130. Cf. J.Hubaux-M.Leroy, art.cit. (in n.219 above), 233-239.
301. Tac.Ann. 1.8.2.
302. Pliny 7.176-77.
303. Lucan Phars.6.570ff.



304. Ibid., 6.716-18 (for the differing interpretations of "nostri", see Budé edit. of Lucan, n.ad loc. See also Adnotationes sup.Lucanum ed. J.Endt (Teubner), ad Phars. 6.716, which reads "omnia" and takes "Pomp-eiana" with "umbra"). Cf. V.Gardthausen, Augustus und Seine Zeit, I, p.271, and P.Grenade, "Le mythe de Pompée et les Pompéiens sous les Césars, "Revue des Étud.Anc., 52(1950), 28-63, at 37ff.
305. This same Proculcius at a later time put an end to his own life by taking gypsum, when suffering from a disease in the stomach: Pliny 36.183.
306. See Suet.Aug.16.3. Cf. also R.Hanslik in RE Bd.XXIII, I(1957) s.v. "Proculcius", no.2, col.73, lines 10-16; V.Gardthausen, Augustus und seine Zeit, I, p.270 and n.21.
307. For Agrippa's aedileship in 33, see Frontinus Aq. 1.9, 2.98, Dio 49.43.1. The aedileship usually preceded the consulship by at least six years: Agrippa, however, had been consul in 37. His example was unprecedented under the Republic: cf.R.Hanslik in RE Bd. IXA. I(1961), s.v. "M.Vipsanius Agrippa" no.2, col.1241 for the political reasons behind this move. Even the ancients recognised that this was an unusual step: cf. Pliny 36.105 "M.Agrippae in aedilitate post consulatum"; so also Frontinus Aq.1.9,2.98, Dio 49.43.1.
308. Cf. Frontinus Aq. 1.10(it first began to flow on June 9) (Frontinus Aq.1.9, in discussing the aqueducts built or repaired by Agrippa in 33, omits, it should be noted, any mention of the Aqua Virgo); Dio 54.11.7. See S. Platner-T.Ashby, A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, p.28, s.v. "Aqua Virgo".
309. Pliny 36.121. See also 35.26 "exstat certe eius [sc. Agrippae] oratio magna et maximo civium digna de tabulis omnibus signisque publicandis".
310. Front.Aq.2.99. See Münzer, Beiträge, p.397-8: The Commentarii seem to have been confined to matters connected with the aqueducts.

311. Pliny 31.42 may also err in connecting the name of the aqueduct with the rivus Herculaneus: cf. Front. Aq.1.10, and also Platner-Ashby, Top.Dict.Anc.Rome., pp.26,28.
312. Plut.Ant.56 (ie.32BC).
313. Pliny 22.7.
314. Dio 51.19.5.
315. Augustus Res Gestae 34.2 (edit. P.Brunt and J.Moore).
316. Cf. B.Scardigli, "A proposito di due passi su Sertorio," Atene e Roma N.S.15, Fasc.4. (1970), 175 and n.7bis. Pliny's statement (22.13 ad fin "nec praeterea quemquam hac (ie. corona obsidionali) invenimus donatum" errs by ignoring Julius Caesar's winning of the corona obsidionalis (see S.Weinstock, Divus Julius, pp.148ff.). The award seems to have taken on a new function by the time of Julius Caesar: at any rate, whereas previously the winner was presented with the crown by his soldiers, now it was presented (as in the case of Augustus) by the Senate and People of Rome. Likewise, Q.Fabius Maximus (whose honours curiously correspond in many ways to those of Augustus: cf.Weinstock, Div.Jul., p.150, n.3) was presented with the corona graminea, according to one version, by his soldiers, but (somewhat anachronistically), according to another, by the Senate and People of Rome (see Weinstock, Div.Jul., pp.149ff. and Reference 36, above) for having liberated Rome from siege (as also in Julius Caesar's case) and not as a memorial for a single episode in the war, such as the rescue in 217 of the army of his magister equitum, M.Minucius Rufus: cf. Gellius 5.6.10 and Pliny 22.10.
317. = M.Valerius Messala Corvinus cos.suff. of 31: see RE s.v. "Valerius Messalla Corvinus" no.261.
318. They were another branch of the gens Valeria.
319. = M.Valerius Messala Rufus cos.53: see RE s.v. "Valerius Messalla Rufus" no.268.
320. See Pliny 7.54, Suet.Div.Jul.59, Plut.Caes.52.2, Dio 42.58.2.

321. Cic.Brut.16.62, Livy 8.40.
322. M.Hofmann, in RE Bd.XVIII.2(1942) s.v. "Pacuvius" no.7 and 12, argues that Pliny's Pacuvius is identical with the tr.plebis of 27. C.Cichorius, Römische Studien, pp.285-88 argues that the Sextus Pacuvius of 27, whom Dio 53.20.2 says was called by some authorities Apudius, was in reality the M.Ampudius from Formiae, who was both tr.plebis and plebeian aedile (CIL 10.6082), and that Pliny's Pacuvius is to be identified with the tr.plebis of 8BC. Hofmann (col.2177) argues that the holding of both these offices was impossible by this late date, but he fails to take the information in Dio 55.24.9 into account. Cichorius may well then be right.
323. Dio 55.24.9.
324. Vell.Pat.2.93.2, Suet.Aug.66.3, Ti.10.1, Dio 53.32.1; Tac.Ann.6.51, Dio 53.33.4.
325. Dio 53.30-1(see also 54.3.2). Cf. A.Gaheis in RE Bd. 3(1899), s.v. "Claudius" no.230, cols.2766-7.
326. Eg. Augustus Res Gestae 26.5, Strabo 2.5.12, p.118, 16.4.22-4, pp.780-82, 17.1.53, p.819, Josephus Ant. Jud. 15.317, Dio 53.29.
327. However, Augustus Res Gestae 26.5 says that Gallus' furthest point of penetration was Mariba. Dio 53.29.8 says the furthest point reached was Athlula, and Strabo 16.4.24, p.782 says Gallus mastered Athrula and then advanced to the town of Marsiaba (=Mariba?). See J.G.C. Anderson, Cambridge Ancient History, X, p.251 and p.877, n.1, and A.Grohmann in RE Bd.14(1930), s.v. "Marsyaba," cols.1983-85.
328. By the Lex Gellia-Cornelia: Cicero pro Balb.19, SHA Balbinus 7.3. His original non-citizen status is confirmed by Vell.Pat.2.51.3.
329. See R. Syme, Rom.Rev., pp.362, 372-73.
330. Seneca de clem.1.15.4 calls him a "homo locuples".

331. Possibly from veterans, possibly from people suspected of being lukewarm towards Octavian. See V.Gardthausen, Augustus und seine Zeit, I, pt.1, p.403. Cf. T.Frank, Econ.Survey, V, p.170.
332. Dio 50.14.
333. His consulship is also referred to in Fasti Biondiani et Colotiani, CIL I<sup>2</sup>, pp.64-5, ad ann. 16BC.
334. Arbale is not mentioned in C.M. Wells, The German Policy of Augustus (Oxford, 1972), but Pliny may receive some confirmation from Dio 54.33.2 (=11BC) and from an incident recorded in Obsequens No.72 (Loeb edit.) ad ann.11BC: "in Germania in castris Drusi examen apium in tabernaculo Hostili Rufi praefecti castrorum...." But, according to Obsequens, the prodigy had a very different result from that recorded by Pliny: "multitudo Romanorum per insidias subiecta est" (see note ad loc. in Loeb edit.): cf. Münzer, Beiträge, pp.363-64. See also Obsequens no.70 (=42BC).
335. Cf. R.Syme, Rom.Rev., p.354; also S.Treggiari, Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic, pp.239-40. Cf. also Pliny 35.199-200 for a description of the power of certain slaves in the middle of the first century BC. See T.Frank, Econ.Survey, V, p.170.
336. CIL I<sup>2</sup>, 1004=10.6488=Dessau ILS 1924.
337. Cf. Dessau ILS 1924 and Münzer, Beiträge, pp.100-101. But if Mommsen (ad CIL I, 1004) is right in thinking that the collegium of the magistri Capitolinorum (to which Clesippus belonged) inter al. was abolished by Augustus when he divided Rome into 14 regiones, then the inscription must fall within a reasonable distance of 7BC (Dio 55.8).
338. These campaigns were carried on through Augustus' legati (Suet.Aug.20): e.g., Varro Murena against the Salassi in 25 (Livy Epit. 135, Strabo 4.6.7, pp.205-06, Suet. Aug. 21, Dio 53.25, Cassiodorus Chronica ad an. 729AUC.); P.Silius against the Camunni and

Venostes in 16 (Dio 54.20); Tiberius and Drusus against the Raeti and Vindelici in 15 (Suet. Aug. 21); a campaign was launched against the Ligures in 14 (Dio 54.24). Cf. also RE Bd. VIIAI (1939), s.v. "Tropaea Augusti," col. 661-2.

339. CIL 5, 7817. For a discussion of the Tropaeum Augusti see C.-J. Formigé, "Le Trophée de la Turbie," Compt. rend. de l'acad. des inscr., 38 (1910), 76-87, 509-16; and J. Formigé in Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France (1943-44), 360-67; and esp. G.C. Picard, Les Trophées Romains, pp.291-301.
340. V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius<sup>2</sup>, no.40. Cf. also A. Stein, Rom. Inschr. in d.ant.Lit., pp. 31-32.
341. Res Gestae Divi Augusti 26.3 (edit. by P. Brunt and J. Moore). Cf. also Vell. Pat. 2.90: "Alpes feris incultisque nationibus celebres perdomitae." The triumphal arch mentioned in Dio 53.26 (25BC), set up in the Alps in honour of Augustus, does not refer to the trophy here being discussed. It may be the arch still standing at Augusta Praetoria (=modern Aosta) the inscription on which disappeared centuries ago: cf. CIL 5, p.757.
- Pliny asserts (3.138) that his list of states on the trophy does not include those 15 civitates of the Cottian Alps which had not shown hostility. This refers to the people of the Cottian Alps led by M. Julius Cottius who had remained loyal to Rome. (As a result Cottius himself had been "in amicitiam Octaviani principis receptus" (Am. Marcell. 5.10.2) and "asscitus in societatem rei Romanae" (ibid. 15.10.7).) An inscription in fact exists near Segusio in the Alps set up by Cottius himself, which lists 14 states of which he was praefectus: CIL 5, 7231 = Dessau ILS 94, and Ehrenberg and Jones, op.cit. no.166.
- It is interesting to note that while Pliny lists 46 peoples in the Tropaeum Augusti (7/6BC)

and says that this does not include the 15 civitates of the Cottian Alps which had not shown hostility, the list of 14 civitates in Cottius' inscription (9/8BC) includes six of those given by Pliny (viz., Medulli, Caturiges, Edenates, Vesubiani, Veamini, Ecdini). Perhaps Pliny meant some of the civitates referred to (but not named) at the end of Cottius' inscription as "et ceivitates quae sub eo praefecto fuerunt," or else it may be, as D. Detlefsen suggests, in "Das Pomerium Roms und die Grenzen Italiens," Hermes, 21 (1886), 535, the presence of the 6 names on the arch at Segusio proves that the obedience of these peoples to their king (he was in fact a client-king of Rome) was not unconditional, "so dass vielleicht eben deshalb Augustus genöthigt gewesen ist, dem Könige einen Theil seiner Selbständigkeit zu nehmen und ihm zum römischen Praefecten zu machen."

As for the fact that Pliny mentions that 15 civitates had not been hostile, whereas the inscription on the arch at Segusio gives only 14 names, the solution may possibly be correctly given by Detlefsen, op.cit., 535, in Dio 60.24.4 (AD44), who says that M.Julius Cottius, son or grandson of our Cottius, received from Claudius an addition to his ancestral domain which lay in that part of the Alps that bears his family name. These, according to Detlefsen and before him Mommsen (CIL 5, p.825), may have been the Caburriates whose centre was Forum Vibii. The Alpes Cottianae themselves became a province under Nero (Suet. Nero 18). For a discussion of the arch at Segusio cf. E. Ferrero, L'Arc d'Auguste à Suse. Cf. G. Nenci, "Le Cottianae Civitates in Plinio NH III.20," PP 6 (1951), 213-15 who, contrary to general opinion, argues that, with the MSS fluctuating between XII and XV, Pliny is here referring to events of his own time, in which of the 14 civitates mentioned on the arch at Segusio 2 were incorporated in another province, the Alpes Maritimae. Hence he argues XII must be the right figure. Nenci's argument is unconvincing.

342. Cf. G.C. Picard, Les Trophées Romains, pp. 295-6, 300.

343. Asconius p.3 Cl.
344. It might be argued that Pliny's statement is evidence for the granting of citizenship (i.e., status of municipium) by the Lex Pompeia in 89 to the towns of Cispadane Gaul---a much discussed question--and does not refer to the municipia created in 90 by the Lex Julia. But in the context it seems that Pliny is referring throughout to the gentes Alpinae and this applies better to Transpadane Gaul (which received ius Latii, not citizenship, by the Lex Pompeia) rather than to Cispadane Gaul.
345. Crispinius seems to have been chosen out of all Italy as an astonishing example of fecundity to help promote legislation against the falling birth rate (see the Lex Julia de maritandis ordinibus of 18.)
346. Seneca de brev.vit. 4.6.
347. Dio 55.10.15. See also Solinus 1.49.
348. Cf. A.E. Pappano, "Agrippa Postumus, "CP, 36(1941), 41f. See also valuable discussion in E.Meise, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Julisch-Claudischen Dynastie, pp.3-34; also R.Syme, Rom.Rev., pp.425-27.
349. K.Wellesley, "The fable of a Roman attack on Aden," PP, 39(1954), 401-05 is sceptical that Gaius ever got to Arabia at all, let alone sailed on the Red Sea, laying stress on Pliny 6.160: "Nam C.Caesar...prospexit tantum Arabiam."
350. This may be an error on Pliny's part in attaching the Spanish shipwrecks sighted in the Red Sea over a century earlier by Eudoxus to the expedition of Gaius: see Strabo 2.3.4, p.99 and Pliny 2.169 who cites the voyage of Eudoxus just below the reference to Gaius' sighting of Spanish shipwrecks in the Red Sea (ie. Pliny 2.168).
351. But cf. J.G.C. Anderson in Cambridge Ancient History, X, p.253.

352. Horace Carm.2.2.1ff.
353. Perhaps the freedman mentioned in CIL 5.6821 was a worker at this mine.
354. He was probably Sextus Marius: cf. Tac. Ann.6.19 and E. Koestermann, Cornelius Tacitus-Annalen, n.ad loc.
355. F. Münzer, "Zur Kunstgeschichte des Plinius", Hermes, 30 (1895), 499-547, at 544-45 suspects the Ephesian story of being a doublette of Augustus' restoration of Myronian works to Samos, recounted in Strabo 14.1.14, p.637.
356. Suet. Aug.70,90.4. See also L.R. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, pp.118-119.
357. Augustus Res Gestae 24(cf. n.ad loc. in Brunt and Moore). So also Strabo 14.1.14, p.637 says that Augustus restored to Samos two statues by Myron, removed thence by Antony: one of Athena, one of Heracles; a third, of Zeus, he brought to the Capitolium. See also Strabo 13.1.30, p.595.
358. Vell. Pat.2.102, Suet. Ti.12-13, Tac. Ann.3.48. Cf. also Solinus 53.29.
359. Horace Carm.4.9.
360. Hinted at in Suet. Ti.13.
361. Vell. Pat. 2.102:"cuius mors intra paucos dies fortuita an voluntaria fuerit ignoro".
362. Cf. Vell. Pat.2.102, who says that the Parthian king denounced Lollius to Gaius.
363. Cf. Urlichs, Chrest. Plin., n.ad loc. "Möglich, dass Horaz sich in ihm täuschte, wie Augustus, der ihn seinem älteren Sohne Gaius als moderatore iuventae (Vell.2.102) im J.1 v.C. nach Asien als Begleiter gab." See also Syme, Rom. Rev., pp.428-29.
364. Solinus 1.49.



365. Tac.Ann.1.3, Dio 55.10-11. Livia was also accused of causing the death of Marcellus: Dio 53.33.4.
366. Solinus 1.50-51. Dio 54.1.1-2 mentions a famine in the reign of Augustus but places it in 22BC.
367. See M.I. Henderson, "Julius Caesar and Latium in Spain," JRS, 32(1942), 1f.
368. See Henderson, ibid., 1f.
369. Henderson, ibid., 1-13. Cf. also Dio 43.39ff.
370. Augustus Res Gestae 28; cf. also Suetonius Aug.46.
371. W.V. Harris, Rome in Etruria and Umbria, p.305.
372. Ibid., pp.306ff., for a discussion of the individual colonies mentioned by Pliny.
373. Probably Varro: cf. R.Thomsen, The Italic Regions, p.46.
374. Ibid., pp.31-3.
375. Ibid., p.21.
376. Ibid., pp.21ff., where, for example (p.24), the Freginates appear in the alphabetic town-list of the first region (part of which included Latium), although they are in fact also given as the southernmost town of Etruria (which belonged to the seventh region). Cf. also pp.55ff., where a detailed analysis of each region and its frontiers is given.
377. Ibid., p.35.
378. Ibid., pp.28-9.
379. Ibid., pp.311ff. K.G. Sallmann, Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro, demonstrates conclusively (see, for example, pp.265-68) that, contrary to traditional belief, Pliny did not use Varro as his main source for the whole, or even

for large parts, of the geographical books, 3-6 of the Historia Naturalis; Varro rather served Pliny as a means to supplement other sources more important for Pliny such as Agrippa and King Juba II; Varro wrote no broad, geographical survey of the inhabited world (such as the Chorographia of Pomponius Mela in three books) from which Pliny could have derived much of his material; rather, he relied (when using Varro) chiefly upon Varro's Disciplinarum de geometria liber and his Legationum libri III and, in addition, various geographical items from other scattered works of Varro.

On Pliny's geographical sections see further below, Chapter 6 and notes 535-539.

380. See RE Bd.3(1899) s.v. "Celeres", col.1870, Bd.6 (1909) s.v. "Flexuntes", col.2744, Bd.VIIa1 (1939) s.v. "Trossuli", cols. 698-99. See also M.I. Henderson, "The Establishment of the Equester Ordo," JRS, 53 (1963), 70.
381. C. Nicolet, L'Ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine, I, p.140.
382. The Gracchan jurors were probably not exclusively equites equo publico. See E. Badian, Publicans and Sinners, pp.65, 135 n.68.
383. Because of the paucity of primary sources for the period between the Gracchi and Sulla it is impossible to say exactly when men of wealth who had never had the public horse (<sup>ie</sup> ~~eg~~. the iudices Gracchani) began to be called equites, first unofficially then officially. See Henderson, ibid., 70-71. See also A.H.M. Jones, The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate, pp.86ff. He points out, p.87, that Pliny's statement, that the equestrian order after the Civil Wars came to be known as publicani, rests on no supporting evidence; and that Pliny is inaccurate in saying that Cicero established the title equites in his consulate, since Cicero was using the term equites for the pre-Sullan jurors as early as 70BC, and refers to a man with the census equester as an eques as early

- as 76BC. Cf. also E. Badian, Publicans and Sinners, p.83.
384. Pliny does not mention this law of 67, but he does allude to its reenactment by the emperor Augustus (33.32): the Lex Julia Theatralis.
385. Cf. Tacitus Ann.1.7.3 "senatus milesque et populus" and 14.11.1 "militi patribusque et plebi".
386. Originally in the 4th-3rd cent.BC the gold ring was reserved, it seems, for a minority in the Senate: cf. Livy 9.46.12 (304BC) with Pliny 33.18 (see also Pliny 33.11 "For a long period indeed, it is quite clear, not even members of the Roman senate had gold rings, inasmuch as rings were bestowed officially on men about to go as envoys to foreign nations, and on them only...."). The first known example of the "promiscuus usus anuli" dates from the Second Punic War: Livy 23.12.2 (216BC) (cf. also Dio 48.45.8). But the usage of the gold ring took some time to spread even among those who had the right to wear it: Marius did not assume a gold ring until his third consulship (103BC) (Pliny 33.12); nor even at the period of the Social War did all the members of the Senate possess gold rings (Pliny 33.21).
387. Ie. Sex.Roscius of Ameria: Macrobius Sat.3.14.13.
388. Ie. Verres and his amici: Cicero II in Verr.3.185f.
389. Ie. the playwright D. Laberius: Cicero ad Fam.10.32.2 (cf. also Suet. Div.Jul.33), Seneca Controv.7.3.9, Suet. Div.Jul. 39, Gellius NA 8.15,17.14, Macrobius Sat.2.3.10, 7.2f., 7.3.8.
390. Cf. Pliny 33.20.
391. Pace Pliny 33.30: "equitum nomen subsistebat in turmis equorum publicorum". See A.H.M. Jones, "The Elections under Augustus," JRS, 45(1955), 14f.
392. Pliny 33.32 is unusually precise about the date: "Tiberii demum principatu nono anno...C.Asinio

Pollione C.Antistio Vetere cos. anno urbis conditae DCCLXXV."

393. See E.Badian and F.Millar in The Oxford Classical Dictionary<sup>2</sup>, s.v. "Equites". Cf. also Nicolet, L'Ordre équestre, I, pp.163-65.
394. Pliny 33.34, and 29 ("quod antea", etc.).
395. Jones, "The Elections under Augustus," 15.
396. The Tabula Hebana, lines 55-57, demonstrates that by AD 19 there existed other members of the equestrian order besides those with the public horse, distinguishing between "ii qui equom pub.habebunt" and "ii qui ordini [equestri adscripti nec publicum equum habebunt". Again, Pliny is not as clear as he might have been, when he says (33.30) that when Augustus established his four jury panels the majority of the judges belonged to the iron ring class, and were called iudices not equites, the latter title being reserved for the men with the equus publicus. The official Tabula Hebana, lines 8, 11-12, however, makes the matter clear, referring to "senatores et equites omnium decuriarum quae iudicior, publicor, caussa constitutae sunt". See also Jones, "The Elections under Augustus," 15 and Crim.Courts of Rom.Rep. and Princ., pp.89-90. Cf. also Dio 56.42.2 (AD14) and 55.2.3 (9BC), with Suet.Aug.32-40, who distinguishes between two groups of equites.
397. Pliny implies that some iudices (but not the majority of them) had it. Of course these could all have been equites equo publico (33.30). See the summary in Henderson, "The Establishment of the Equester Ordo," 71.
398. Suet.Aug.32.
399. At 33.33 "quoniam in ferreo anulo et equites iudice-sque intellegebantur" Pliny clearly errs, unless, as Henderson, ibid., 68, suggests, the whole is a gloss

inserted by a confused scholiast. At 33.31 among the different kinds of Augustan iudices Pliny mentions the tribuni aerarii. They never appear again. They may perhaps have been revived after their suppression by Caesar, but, if so, the revival seems to have been short-lived: it is perhaps more probable that Pliny is confusing the late Republican with Augustan memories. Cf. Jones, "The Elections under Augustus," 16 and n.80.

400. See A.M. Duff, Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire, App.II, pp.214ff. See especially Dio 48.45.9 (38BC) on the significance of the gold ring for freedmen (it makes them look like knights?).

Chapter 5

401. Eg. Pliny 2.167; 4.54; 5.25; 7.149 (other authors say Octavian was wounded in Pannonia); 10.36 etc.
402. The result of this bias is that of the 109 References 88 occur in Italy and 5 in the western Mediterranean, viz. Spain, Gaul and Sicily.
403. Praefatio 17. Nor must the possibility be dismissed of errors arising from mistakes by Pliny's amanuensis: cf. Pliny Epp. 3.5.14-15. See also Quintilian's remarks on errors in Seneca's works (Inst. Orat. 10.1.128): "multa rerum cognitio, in qua tamen aliquando ab his, quibus inquirenda quaedam mandabat, deceptus est." Faulty copying of MSS has also introduced some errors: as an example one can cite 2.224 where the text, as we have it, reads invectus amnis instead of the Iuven-cus amnis, which must be what Pliny wrote (C. Letta, I Marsi e il Fucino nell'Antichità, p.12).
404. Praef. 18-19. This is confirmed by the Younger Pliny Epp 3.5. See M.Schanz, Geschichte d.römischen Literatur (1. von Müller's Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. VII:
405. Praef. 17. Teil II, ed.4 by C.Hosius, pp.775-76.
- 405 a. Pliny 7.8.
406. Pliny Epp. 3.5.6.
407. Pliny 33.55-56.
408. Pliny 14.95-97.
409. Pliny 15.2-3, 18.15-17.
410. Pliny 33.7.
411. Pliny 33.78.
412. Pliny 33.132.
413. Pliny 33.147-148.
414. Pliny 16.15.
415. Pliny 17.7.
416. Pliny 34.20.

- 417. Pliny 3.34.
- 418. Pliny 9.119-121.
- 419. Pliny 2.235.
- 420. Pliny 6.181-182.
- 421. Pliny 2.199.
- 422. Pliny 2.200.
- 423. Pliny 5.58.
- 424. Pliny 2.93-94.
- 425. Pliny 6.47.
- 426. Pliny 32.3.
- 427. Pliny 33.12, 111.
- 428. Pliny 8.15.
- 429. Pliny 19.137.
- 430. Pliny 25.5-7.
- 431. Pliny 33.29-36.
- 432. Pliny 18.37.
- 433. Pliny 3.46.
- 434. Pliny 15.77-78, 22.13, 34.21-26, 36.101-112.
- 435. Cf. Pliny 35.11.
- 436. Pliny 7.100, 112-113, 14.44.
- 437. Pliny 7.95-99.
- 438. Pliny 9.119, 21.12.
- 439. Pliny 7.91-94.

440. Pliny 7.147-150.
441. Pliny 35.10.
442. K.G. Sallmann, Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro, (Berlin, 1971).
443. See, for example, H.Le Bonniec, "Bibliographie de L'Histoire Naturelle de Pline l'Ancien," REL, 23 (1945), 208-209.
444. Cf. Münzer, Beiträge, p.3; see also Sallmann, Die Geographie des älteren Plinius, especially pp.162-164.
445. Pliny Praef. 17.
446. A list of all the authors cited by Pliny, both in the Index (146 Roman, 327 foreign) and in the text, is to be found in the Teubner text of the Historia Naturalis, edit. L.Jan, vol.6.
447. For a discussion of the Index Auctorum, see W. Kroll in RE Bd.XXI.1(1951), s.v. "Plinius der "Alter", cols. 424-428.
448. See Pliny 3.1 "quapropter auctorem neminem unum sequar, sed ut quemque verissimum in quaque parte arbitrabor...".
449. See Pliny Praef. 22-23 "scito enim conferentem auctores me deprehendisse a iuratissimis et proximis veteres transcriptos ad verbum neque nominatos....Obnoxii profecto animi et infelicis ingenii est deprehendi in furto malle quam mutuum reddere, cum praesertim sors fiat ex usura".
450. See Pliny 7.8 "nec tamen ego in plerisque eorum obstringam fidem meam, potiusque ad auctores relegabo qui dubiis reddentur omnibus, modo ne sit fastidio Graecos sequi tanto maiore eorum diligentia vel cura vetustiore".
451. Pliny Praef. 22.
452. Pliny 3.1.
453. Pliny Epp. 3.5.10-11.



454. Pliny Praef. 22.
455. See Münzer, Beiträge, p.56. Cf. also G. Boissier, Étude sur la Vie et les ouvrages de M.T. Varron, p.374 n.1: "Un curieux passage de Lydus nous fait voir que de son temps on ne citait que Varron, et l'on ne connaissait ses devanciers que par lui: ὡς Φερεστέλλας καὶ Σισένας οἱ Ῥωμαῖοί φασιν, ὧν τὰς χρήσεις ὁ Βάρρων ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ἀνήγαγεν. Ἐγὼ δὲ τὰς βίβλους οὕτω τεθέαμαι. (De magistr., p.269)."
456. Eg. in the discussion of the discovery of the books of Numa at 13.84-87. See also Munzer, Beitrage, pp. 12ff., 30ff.
457. Pliny 7.115,16.7.
458. Pliny 7.115.
459. Pliny 18.23.
460. Pliny 35.11.
461. Eg. Pliny 7.95-99.
462. See Münzer, Beiträge, pp.280ff.
463. Eg. Pliny 3.39.
464. See Münzer, Beiträge, p. 171 (Reference 3), p.258 (References 4,5), p.377 n.1 (Reference 6), p.270 (Reference 12), p.224 (Reference 16), p.227 (Reference 22), pp.232-33 (Reference 23), p.307 (Reference 25), pp.245, 248 (Reference 28), p.269 (Reference 31), p.228 (Reference 35), p.194 n.1 (Reference 38), pp.235,294-95 (Reference 44), pp.235-37 (Reference 58), pp.124, 182 (Reference 62), pp.148-49 (Reference 65); for Reference 36 see S. Weinstock, Divus Julius, p.152. For further examples of Pliny's confusing like-named persons, especially in his chapters on art history (which derive ultimately from Varro) see S. Ferri, Plinio il Vecchio, pp.23-25, and F. Coarelli, "Classe dirigente romana e arti figurative," Dialoghi di Archeologia, 4-5 (1970-71),

- 256f.; cf. also M.W. Frederiksen, "The Contribution of Archaeology to the Agrarian Problem in the Gracchan Period," ibid, 351, 355f., who remarks on Varro's ignorance of agricultural matters. See also L. Ross, Archäologische Aufsätze, vol. II, pp.352ff.; Münzer, Beiträge, pp.119ff., RE XXI. 1 (1951), s.v. "Plinius der Ältere," cols. 428-30; Sallmann, Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro pp. 28ff. Many writers have drawn attention to errors in Varro: eg. P. Boyancé in Rev. Etudes Anc., 57 (1955), 57-84; L.R. Taylor, Voting Districts of Rom.Rep., pp.5,28,61; E.T. Salmon, Samnium and the Samnites, p. 145; J. Poucet in Etudes Classiques, 39 (1971), 140; E. Rawson in PBSR, n.s. 26 (1971), 29.
465. Of course Pliny used other sources directly to supplement Varro, the most important being Cornelius Nepos, who appears in the Index in 16 books and is quoted in the text 21 times (see Münzer, Beiträge, pp.322ff. Nepos died ca.24 BC) and Verrius Flaccus, who appears in the Index in 11 books and in the text 6 times (see Münzer, Beiträge, pp.299ff.). He was an antiquarian and taught the grandsons of Augustus, Lucius and Gaius Caesar. On Pliny's method of using sources in general see H. Nissen, "Die Historien des Plinius," Rh.M., 26 (1871), 500.
466. See Münzer, Beiträge, pp.162-284.
467. Curiously, just as Livy is conspicuously absent from the pages of Pliny (he is mentioned in the Index in books 2,3,6,7 in the text at Praef. 16 and in Book 3.4, 132), so also is Varro noticeably missing from the pages of Livy (see R.M. Ogilvie, A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5, p.6).
468. Livy 30.45.5.
469. Pliny 18.23.
470. Eg. Pliny 3.129.
471. Eg. Pliny 33.55-56.

472. Eg. Pliny 7.39-46, 139, 157, 8.16, 11.174, 34.64.  
(though one passage 18.17 makes it clear that he got information about the Metelli from other sources besides their family archives, perhaps from Varro, as Pliny here states).
473. Eg. Pliny 8.159, 162, 28.34.
474. Eg. Pliny 7.80, 13.83, 14.56.
475. Eg. Pliny 11.55.
476. See above, Chapter 5 and especially notes 338-341:  
See, too, A. Stein, "Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur", espec. p.34. F. Münzer, Beiträge, p.399 n.1 lists passages of which he says "Direkte Benutzung von Urkunden und Inschriften verschiedenster Art scheint mir ziemlich gesichert." (namely, 3.136ff., 7.82, 162-164, 210, 16.237(?), 22.13, 29.9, 11(?), 31.6-8, 33.54, 34.93, 35.27f., 115). It should be noted that most of these inscriptions refer to monuments in or near Rome, the exceptions being 3.136ff. (the Tropaeum Augusti above Monte Carlo) and 31.6-8 (at Cicero's villa between Lake Avernus and Puteoli); hence Pliny, feasibly, could have made an autopsy of some inscriptions had he chosen to do so.
477. For example, Livy (4.20.7) did not bother to check what was the status of Cornelius Cossus when he won the spolia opima, although it was recorded on his linen corslet in the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitol.

Chapter 6

478. Pliny Epp. 3.5.5; cf. too Epp. 5.8.5: "avunculus meus idemque per adoptionem pater historias et quidem religiosissime scripsit."
479. A.D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio, I, p.258.
480. Tacitus Hist. 3.28, Ann. 1.69, 13.20, 15.53.
481. A. Momigliano, "Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone." RAL, Ser. VI, 7-8 (1931-32), 331ff.
482. G.B. Townend, "The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius," Hermes, 88 (1960), 98ff.; "Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny," Hermes, 89 (1961), 227ff.; "Some Rhetorical Battle-Pictures in Dio," Hermes, 92 (1964), 467ff.; "Cluvius Rufus in the Histories of Tacitus," AJPh, 85(1964), 337ff.
483. A.D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio, I, pp.257-59.
484. J. Wilkes, "Julio-Claudian Historians," CW, 65 (1972), 183-84.
485. R. Syme, Tacitus, p.295; cf. also Wilkes (n.484 above).
486. Tacitus Ann.15.53 criticises Pliny's view with respect to the aim of the Pisonians as absurd; Hist. 3.28 disparages Pliny, refusing to prefer him to Messalla with respect to the sacking of Cremona; Ann. 1.69, 13.20 names Pliny, but does not endorse him.
487. Pliny Praef. 12-15, 20.
488. Pliny 7.179.
489. See notes 465, 467, above.
490. See, for example, References 3,33,42 where Pliny follows the antiquarian rather than the annalistic tradition.
491. See the remarks of A. Labhardt in Mélanges Offerts à M. Max Niedermann, pp. 108-11, who rejects the view that

it is Pliny to whom Seneca is referring: "But now this vain passion for learning useless things has assailed the Romans also. In the last few days I heard someone telling who was the first Roman general to do this or that; Duilius was the first who won a naval battle, Curius Dentatus was the first who had elephants led in his triumph..." (de Brev. Vit. 13.3-9).

492. See Seneca QN 3 praef. "quanto satius est quid faciendum sit quam quid factum quaerere". Seneca's QN may have been the immediate spark to touch off Pliny's HN, but the man who really stirred up general interest in natural history was that mild and rational Stoic, Posidonius: see A.D. Nock, "Posidonius," JRS, 49(1959), 14-15. Seneca shows that there was considerable interest in natural history about the middle of the first century AD: besides the QN even the skit (usually attributed to him) on the deification of Claudius contains allusions to the phenomena of nature (see J.L. Heller, "Some Points of Natural History in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis," in Homenaje a Antonio Tovar (Madrid, 1972), pp.181-92). Pliny was evidently writing on a fashionable subject.
493. That is, as the Quaestiones Naturales now stands; in fact, the work was originally even longer, some sections having dropped out: see T.H. Corcoran, Seneca, Naturales Quaestiones, vol. I, pp.xix-xx.
494. Seneca's sources include almost forty authors cited by him, of whom only five are Latin writers (Caecina, Fabianus, Livy, Sallust, Varro), the rest Greek, ranging in time from the earliest Pre-Socratic thinkers, such as Thales, to Greek authors of his own time. For Book 2 of the Historia Naturalis Pliny lists in his Index Auctorum seventeen Latin authors (including Varro, Q.Tubero, L.Piso, Livy, Cornelius Nepos, Coelius Antipater, Valerius Antias - all historians) and twenty-six Greek authors.
495. Pliny Epp. 3.5.10.

496. It seems probable that there is some connection between the source for the item at 3.70 about Apiolae (Valerius Antias) and the woman involved in the incident at 7.69 at Suessa Pometia (a certain Valeria).
497. Pliny 35.8.
498. Pliny 33.134.
499. Pliny 34.137. See also the curiously similar story of the two myrtles, the patrician and the plebeian at 15.120-21.
500. The Metellus concerned is usually identified as L. Metellus Delmaticus (cos.119), although M.G. Morgan argues strongly that it is more probably L. Metellus (cos.251 and 247): see " 'Metellus Pontifex' and Ops Opifera: A Note on Pliny Naturalis Historia 11.174," Phoenix, 27 (1973), 35-41.
501. See P. Grimal, "Encyclopédies antiques," CHM, 9 (1965-66), 459-82. Cf. also D. Detlefsen, Untersuchungen über die Zusammensetzung der Naturgeschichte des Plinius, p.19.
502. See RE Bd.XXI.1 (1951) s.v. "Plinius der Ältere," col. 418: "Seine Geographie ist römisch orientirt..., ja eigentlich sein ganzes Werk." Cf also RE Suppl.Bd. 4(1901) s.v. "Geographie (Plinius)," col.675-76.
503. Pliny 3.122, 7.8.
504. Pliny Epp.3.5.10-17. Some of these slips may be due to faults of memory, for the ancients were only too likely to commit errors when they quoted from memory instead of from written sources.
505. Cf. Pliny 3.1, 6.141.
506. Cf. Pliny Praef. 17.
507. Eg. Pliny 18.32 "novissimus villam in Misenensi posuit C.Marius VII cos." (see Münzer, Beiträge, p.60 n.1); cf. above n.299; see also Münzer, Beiträge, p.38 n.1, p.123 para.2.

508. Pliny Praef. 20.
509. Cf. Pliny 2.18.
510. Pliny 2.18. On Josephus and the Flavians see J. Wilkes, "Julio-Claudian Historians," CW, 65(1972), 181-82.
511. Pliny 33.41.
512. Pliny 2.117 ("nunc vero pace tam festa"); 36.27,102.
513. Pliny Praef. 6.
514. Pliny 14.55, 16.8, 33.34.
515. Pliny 7.137-8, 22.12.
516. Pliny 7.93-99, esp.7.96.
517. Pliny 7.104.
518. Pliny 7.117.
519. Pliny 33.134; cf. also Seneca QN 5.18.10.
520. Pliny 7.117.
521. Pliny 9.119-22, 14.147-48, 21.12-13.
522. Pliny 7.93-4.
523. Pliny 7.92.
524. Pliny 16.7-8.
525. Pliny 22.10.
526. Pliny 22.13. See also above, notes 164 and 316.
527. Eg. Pliny 3.138, 37.201-03. See also Vergil Georgics 2.136-76. In discussing Pliny's primary concern with Rome and Italy, one must enter a mild caveat against

exaggeration. He tells us something about Roman activity in Illyricum, even if he is not too informative on what Octavian did there (7.149); and, but for him, what would we know of Balbus' expedition against the Garamantes in north Africa (5.36-7) or about the furthest limits of Pompey's penetration towards the Caspian (6.51-2)?

528. Pliny 21.52.
529. Pliny 3.39.
530. Cicero de Leg.2.2.5.
531. Vergil Aen. 6.847-53.
532. Pliny 2.117. See A.N. Sherwin-White, The Roman Citizenship, p.262.
533. Eg. the career of L.Tarius Rufus (Reference 94), and of C. Crispinius Hilarus (Reference 100).
534. See R.Syme, The Roman Revolution,<sup>2</sup> p.8. Cf. also Cato the Elder's interest in the Italians in his Origines: Dion.Hal. 1.11.1; Fronto p.203N.
535. See A.N. Sherwin-White, Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome, p.38f.
536. A phalera from Vetera mentions "Plinio praefec(to)"; CIL 13.10026,22; see, too, Pliny Epp.3.5.4, and various references in the Historia Naturalis (eg. 2.121, 7.36, 18.183). He served in three different posts in the Rhineland between AD47 and 48. Particularly important was his procuratorship of Belgica ca.AD74 or 75 (HN 18.183), since it made him the paymaster of all the troops along the Rhine.
537. Pliny 29.54, 30.13 (where he says that Tiberius suppressed Druidism in Gaul. Suetonius Claudius 25.5 says that it was Claudius, yet Pliny must surely be right: see above, n.209).
538. He may well have served in them. On the basis of an inscription from the island of Aradus near the



Phoenician coast (it is addressed to a [αἰὼν]ίτιον Σεκοῦν[δον]) Mommsen attributes to Pliny a post on the staff of Titus in the Jewish War of AD 70 (which might, therefore, be the time of their castrense contubernium: Pliny Praef. 3), a procuratorship of Syria, and the post of prefect of the 22nd legion in Egypt: Hermes, 19(1884), 644ff.

539. To some extent Pliny's shortcomings can be remedied with the help of information deriving from elsewhere, coinage issues for instance. Pliny's distinction between 'Coele Syria' and 'the rest of Syria' and his lists of communities composing the two regions are muddled in the extreme. His roster of the cities in 'Coele Syria' is a pastiche, presumably of his own compilation; that for 'the rest of Syria', despite its evident derivation from an official list dating from the early years of Augustus, omits much, the cities of the Phoenician coast, for instance, but includes communities that were not cities at all, such as the Gazetae and the Tardytenses (a mistake for Tarutenses?). See A.H.M. Jones, The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, pp.133-35, 260-66, 312, 372, and, above all, 503-08.
540. Note, for example, his remarks at HN Praef. 16; 3.5, 14.2, 16.4, and esp. 27.3 "May this gift of the gods last, I pray, for ever. So truly do they seem to have given to the human race the Romans as it were a second Sun." This patriotism, moreover, emerges in the general purpose of the Historia Naturalis, wherein Pliny hopes to offset the predominance of the Greeks in this field: see Praef. 1 "Libros Naturalis Historiae, novicium Camenis Quiritium opus...". And though he is not their complete adversary (Praef.26), nevertheless, as it seems to him, Roman authors are more serious than the Greeks: the latter have fine titles for works with nothing in them (see Praef.24).
541. See F. Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, pt. 2A, pp.138, 140-50.
542. The description of Timaeus found in Polybius 12.24.5.
543. See Athenaeus 4.36; Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechi-

- schen Historiker, pt.2A, pp.329-31. See also Pliny 2.43.
544. Livy 9.17.1.
545. Pliny himself (Praef.12) says that the Historia Naturalis does not allow of "digressions, nor of speeches or dialogues, nor marvellous accidents or unusual occurrences - matters interesting to relate or entertaining to read". This is true only in the sense that he claims to be writing natural and not the usual kind of history (cf. his remarks at 2.43 "We forsooth feel no gratitude towards those whose assiduous toil has given us illumination on the subject of this luminary (ie. the moon), while owing to a curious disease of the human mind we are pleased to enshrine in history records of bloodshed and slaughter, so that persons ignorant of the facts may be acquainted with the crimes of mankind" - this view, of course, is also reflected in his antiquarian interests in history); otherwise, the Historia Naturalis is in fact full of digressions, marvels etc.: see References 14,25,84,109.
546. Eg. Pliny 36.6, 118-20.
547. Eg. Pliny 7.173, 13.25, 15.74-6, 33.49, 134, 137, 153, 35.199-201, 37.15.
548. There is also some connection with Italy here. The literary convention was that Italy was sober, industrious and moral as contrasted with Rome which was corrupt, gay and licentious.
549. Vergil Aen. 8.334.
550. See J. Ferguson, The Religions of the Roman Empire, p.79.
551. Servius ad Aen. 8.334.
552. Pope, Essay on Man, 1.267-68.
553. Note the remarks of R. Heinze, Die augusteische Kultur<sup>2</sup>, p.53.

554. Cicero de Divinatione 1.3.6.
555. See, for example, such a passage as Quaestiones Naturales 2.38.2. Other works by Seneca are also impregnated with Stoicism, the de Providentia, for example.
556. Cf. Cicero de Leg.1.6ff. Pliny's nephew Epp. 5.8. comments on topics for history: one who tackles an early period already written up by others (vetera et scripta) will find parata inquisitio but onerosa collatio as his lot. This certainly applied to the Elder Pliny, for the Republican period had already been covered by Livy inter alios; but one who attempts a more recent period not yet written up by others (intacta et nova) faces graves offensae and levis gratia (cf. Tacitus' remarks at Ann. 1.1, Hist.1.1, 2.101). Cf. Dio 53.19.2f. on the differences between history under the Republic and under the Principate.
557. Pliny Epp. 3.5.1 : De Iaculatione Equestri, De Vita Pomponi Secundi and Bella Germaniae under Claudius; Studiosus and Dubius Sermo under Nero; A Fine Aufidi Bassi under Vespasian.
558. This is especially true of the De Iaculatione Equestri, the Studiosus and the Dubius Sermo, although we do know that the first-named was the product of Pliny's youth (Pliny Epp. 3.5.3), that the author of the Studiosus was "doctus" and "nimirum curiosus" (Quint. Inst. Orat. 11.3.143) and divided his work "in sex volumina propter amplitudinem" (Pliny Epp. 3.5.5), and that the Dubius Sermo was written in Nero's last years (Pliny Epp. 3.5.5).
559. See Munzer, Beiträge, p.400 n.1. There may also be reference to Pliny's penchant for curious details in Tacitus Ann. 15.41, Hist. 2.50.
560. Pliny Epp. 3.5.4.
561. Pliny 2.199, 232.
562. Pliny 7.80. See also Pliny 7.39, where he relates curious details of a woman named Vistilia, apparently mother

of the poet Pomponius Secundus: C.Cichorius, Römische Studien, pp.429ff. and R. Syme, Tacitus, p.289 n.3, 297 n.11, 373 n.5. Pliny undoubtedly got the information from Pomponius himself and may have included it in the Vita - another example of Pliny's fondness for the unusual.

563. Pliny Epp.3.5.5.
564. Quintilian Inst.Orat. 11.3.143; cf. also 11.3.148.
565. Pliny 7.84.
566. Tacitus Ann. 13.31.1, which should be read in conjunction with Pliny 16.200 and Suet. Nero 12.
567. Pliny 13.83.
568. Pliny 14.56.
569. Tacitus Ann.1.69.2; 15.53.4.
570. Tacitus Hist. 3.28.1. This fragment, it should be noted, gives us the important information that Pliny as a pro-Flavian historian made every effort to defend the beginnings of the Flavians' rise to power from later reproaches and attacks.
571. Tacitus Ann. 13.20; 15.53.
572. Suet. Cal. 8.1.
573. Quintilian Inst.Orat. 11.3.143.
574. Tac.Ann. 15.53.
575. According to the Younger Pliny Epp.3.5.4, the Bella Germaniae was a tendentious work, written to rescue from unjust oblivion the memory of Drusus, who had triumphed far and wide in Germany and had died there (in 9BC). The work<sup>k</sup> may well have also contained praise of the emperor Claudius (during whose reign it was probably written), the son of Drusus. It seems to have been fairly comprehensive, being written in

20 libri, "quibus omnia quae cum Germanis gessimus bella collegit"; hence, it seems to have gone beyond the limited scope of Drusus' exploits, perhaps beginning with the exploits of Marius at the end of the second century BC. It may also have been intended to supersede the work of Aufidius Bassus (whether in scope or tendency or both) who wrote, according to Quintilian Inst.Orat. 10.1.103, libri belli Germanici. Tacitus' Germania may have been a riposte to Pliny's work, for he implies, at any rate, that some of those who wrote on Germany before he did were guilty of gullibility and poor judgement in general (Germania 2,3). Contra, however, Pliny, as we learn from Suetonius Cal. 8.1ff., believed that Gaius was born in Treviris and Tacitus apparently picked up this error from Pliny, for he says Ann. 1.41 that Gaius was infans in castris genitus. Here, at least, Tacitus seems to have trusted Pliny. Perhaps then his remark on the gullibility of some of his predecessors included Aufidius Bassus but not Pliny. Certainly, at any rate, Tacitus knew and used Pliny's work (perhaps preferring it to that of Aufidius Bassus), for he quotes him at Annales 1.69.2: "Plinius, Germanicorum bellorum scriptor". Tacitus' emphasis, however, seems to have differed from Pliny's, for the latter wrote on bella fought with the Germans, while the former confined himself to the situs and origo of the Germans. Symmachus quotes Pliny's work in AD 396 (Epp. 4.18) as if it were still in use then; see also St. Jerome Chronicle ad an. 109 "Plinius... historicus insignis habetur, cuius plurima ingenii opera extant."

576. Pomponius Secundus had been the legate of Upper Germany under Claudius in AD 50: Tacitus Ann. 12.27ff.
577. Pliny Epp. 3.5.3.
578. Cf. Pliny Epp. 3.5.4. See also Syme, Tacitus, p.288.
579. E. Ciaceri, "Claudio e Nerone nelle Storie di Plinio," in Processi politici e Relazioni internazionali, pp.387-434. See also G.B. Townend, "The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius, " Hermes, 88 (1960), 98-120, and "Traces

in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny," Hermes, 89 (1961), 227-48. Townend contrasts the sober and scrupulous Pliny with the more sensational but unreliable Cluvius Rufus, despite the latter's access to superior information. Cf. also A. Momigliano, "Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone," RAL, Ser. VI, 7-8 (1931-32), 293-336, who believes, like Townend, that Pliny was a major source for Tacitus in the latter part of the Annals. Cf. J. Wilkes, "Julio-Claudian Historians," CW, 65(1972), 180ff.

580. If Tacitus Ann. 13.31 does refer to Pliny then the latter must have had some good things to say about Nero - no doubt consistent with his habit of praising the current emperor. He may have changed his mind, however, in the latter part of Nero's reign if we may believe the remarks of his nephew at Epp. 3.5.5, where he gives his uncle's motive for writing the Dubius Sermo ("scripsit sub Nerone novissimis annis, cum omne studiorum genus paulo liberius et erectius periculosum servitus fecisset"). So too Trajan felt that the first five years of Nero's reign, the "quinquennium Neronis," were not intolerable (cf. Aurel. Vict. de Caesaribus 5.2; see also H. Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero<sup>2</sup>, p.315 and n.15). As for Claudius, see Pliny 33.41, where Pliny, who does not in general treat Claudius unfavourably, contrasts him unfavourably with Vespasian.
581. Tac.Ann. 1.1, Hist.1.1, 2.101.
582. Cf. Josephus Ant.Jud. 20.154 with respect to historians of Nero, and also Martial 3.20.4. See also Syme, Tacitus, pp.180, 292 with respect to the Flavian period.
583. Pliny Praef. 20.
584. Ciaceri, "Claudio e Nerone nelle Storie di Plinio," pp.391-93; cf. Syme, Tacitus, pp.292-3.
585. R. Syme, Tacitus, p.139.

586. See H. Nissen, "Die Historien des Plinius," RhM, 26(1871), 500; and P. Fabia, Les Sources de Tacite, pp.194, 197-98. Münzer, Beiträge, p.131 errs in saying "Vollständig versagen die Indices für die Historiographie der Kaiserzeit..." Admittedly Pliny omits contemporary historians such as Servilius Nonianus (who does, however, appear in the text at 28.29 and 37.81), Cluvius Rufus, Fabius Rusticus and Vipstanus Messala, but in the Index Auctorum he does mention (as D. Detlefsen, "Über des älteren Plinius geschichte seiner zeit und ihr verhältniss zum Tacitus," Philologus, 34 (1876), 48-9 had noticed) Domitius Corbulo (Books 5-6), Suetonius Paulinus (Book 5), Licinius Mucianus (Books 2-13, 16, 19, 31, 34-6). One may also add to Detlefsen's list: Cremutius Cordus (Books 7,10,16), Claudius Caesar (Books 5,6,12-13), Agrippina wife of Claudius (Book 7), Seneca (Books 6,9), Titus Caesar (Book 2), Domitian (Book 33). In the body of the Historia Naturalis Pliny twice quotes himself (presumably from A Fine Aufidi Bassi) at 2.199,232; and he quotes once from Aufidius Bassus himself at 6.27; finally, one might also mention the acta diurna (Books 7,8, 10) (cf. Münzer, Beiträge, p.398; and Tacitus Ann. 13.31). See also P. Fabia, Les Sources de Tacite, p. 192.
587. Pliny Praef. 16.
588. Gellius NA 10.12.1. Elsewhere Gellius praises Pliny, although it may be the case that some of his ostensibly laudatory remarks covertly imply criticism: see, for example, NA 3.16.22-4; 9.4.12-13; 9.16.1; 10.12.8.
589. Some 120 MSS are extant: see A. Onnerfors in his review of the Budé edition of Books 21-22 of the Historia Naturalis by J. André in Gnomon, 44 (1972), 138 n.1.
590. Note Gellius' criticism NA 10.12.1 of Pliny for having attributed certain information in natural history to Democritus, and, secondly, Tacitus' remark at Ann. 13.31.1 that in AD57 little worth recording occurred, "nisi cui libeat laudandis fundamentis et trabibus,

quis molem amphitheatri apud campum Martis Caesar extruxerat volumina implere": this is generally taken to refer to HN 16.200, where Pliny records a larch beam of remarkable size, brought to Rome many years before and worked into this amphitheatre. This is rather a criticism of Pliny's interests as an historian, not of his value (cf. A.D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio, I, pp.257-59). On the other hand, Pliny's nephew, not an impartial witness, praises the Historia Naturalis, from the point of view of natural history, as "opus diffusum eruditum, nec minus varium quam ipsa natura": Epp. 3.5.6.

591. Gellius NA 10.12.6-8.
592. Pliny Epp. 3.5.1-6. Suetonius in his Vita Plinii Secundi mentions only the Bella Germaniae and the Historia Naturalis. Perhaps they came to be considered in the second century AD as his chief works.
593. Quintilian in his section on historians Inst.Orat. 10.1.101f. Moreover, at 11.3.143 and again at 11.3.148 Quintilian advances criticisms of the Studiosus.
594. Pliny Praef. 16.
595. See, for example, Pliny 9.119-21, where Cleopatra bets Antony that she can spend 10,000,000 sesterces on a single banquet - and wins, and 17.1-6, where he relates the dispute between Lucius Crassus and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (censors in 92) over the former's excessive luxury while holding the office of censor.
596. See Polybius 12.25e-25h.
597. Cf. Pliny HN Praef. 18; and Pliny Epp.3.5.17.
598. Polybius 12.25e-25h insists that a true historian will (i) carefully study and compare documents, memoirs etc., without, however, being purely an armchair recorder; (ii) personally investigate the areas, both on land and sea, with which his narrative deals; (iii) be one who has engaged in political and other active forms of life; (iv) have personal experience



of military matters. As an imperial procurator Pliny met some at least of these requirements.

599. At Praef. 17 Pliny makes it clear that in the Historia Naturalis he is seeking to retail what others had ignored and what is generally not known or what is abstruse. It would be unwise to confine these remarks only to natural history: they should include the usual kind of history and, hence, the historical references in the Historia Naturalis - for Pliny was an antiquarian. Cf. also his revealing remark at 2.85 "incomperta haec et inextricabilia, sed prodenda quia sunt prodita."
600. See Pliny Epp. 3.5.3 on the De Iaculatione Equestri, which was written "pari ingenio curaque" and 5.8.5 "avunculus meus idemque per adoptionem pater historias et quidem religiosissime scripsit". See also Pliny Epp. 3.5.17, and Pliny HN 6.23 "I do not deny that my description of it will differ in many points from that of the old writers, as I have devoted much care and attention to ascertaining thoroughly the recent events in that region (anxia perquisitis cura rebus nuper in eo situ gestis) from Domitius Corbulo and the kings sent there as suppliants or kings' children sent as hostages". See also Praef. 17, where he claims to have excerpted 20,000 items worthy of attention drawn from 2000 volumina and 100 select authors. Quintilian Inst.Orat. 3.1.21, despite his criticism of Pliny's Studiosus, does concede that Pliny was one of those who had treated rhetoric "accuratius" than certain of his predecessors. Strangely, in his list of Roman historians Inst.Orat. 10.1.101ff. Quintilian mentions Aufidius Bassus and his libri belli Germanici but omits mention of Pliny altogether (unless there is a reference at 10.1.104: "sunt et alii scriptores boni (i.e. of history), sed nos genera degustamus, non bibliothecas excutimus").
601. Pliny Epp. 3.5.1.
602. Tacitus Ann. 15.53. While concluding that Tacitus

seems to have had no high opinion of Pliny, one might ask whether Pliny may not, nevertheless, have influenced Tacitus. On the whole, Tacitus has a pretty good opinion of Pomponius Secundus, and Pliny's life of that worthy may conceivably be responsible: cf. Tacitus Ann. 5.8, 12.28, Dial. de Orat. 13.

603. The austere Tacitus, writing pure political history, found, as Annales 13.31 demonstrates, Pliny's interest in the trivial and curious somewhat distasteful, and this, despite Pliny's claims that, while the Historia Naturalis is nothing but nugae (Praef. 1) and levioris operae (Praef. 12), nevertheless, it was written, as were his other works also, for the utilitas iuvandi rather than for the gratia placendi (Praef. 16). Moreover, as Syme has pointed out (Tacitus, pp.176ff., 271ff.), Tacitus was a consular and a senator, while Pliny was an equestrian and an imperial procurator: Pliny, as such, was never at the centre of events and would simply be disqualified by ~~his~~ his station from furnishing any valuable account of events at the highest level of Roman political life (cf. Wilkes, "Julio-Claudian Historians," CW, 65 (1972), 183-84); in fact, we know that Pliny spent the latter years of Nero's reign in retirement, busy writing his Dubius Sermo (Pliny Epp. 3.5.5); and as Wilkes notes, op.cit., 199 "there are no traces in the Naturalis Historia of any anecdotes depicting Neronian imperial society to compare with those of Gaius' reign." See also A.D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio, I, p.258.

APPENDIX: List of all the references to Roman history  
in the Historia Naturalis, down to the death  
of Augustus.

- 1) The circled References are the Major ones, those that are discussed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4. (Some of the 109 Major References are composite, being made up of two or more passages in the Historia Naturalis. Hence the number of circled passages below exceeds 109).
- 2) The underlined references are the minor ones, those that contain information found only in Pliny, but of an insignificant or trivial nature.
- 3) Those references which are neither circled nor underlined contain historical information that is given also by writers other than Pliny.

Book 2: 24 ; 53 ; 92 ; 92 ; 93-4 ; 96 ; 96 ; 98 ; 98 ; 98 ;  
98 ; 98 ; 99 ; 99 ; 99 ; 99 ; 99 ; 100 ; 100 ; 100 ;  
137 ; 137 ; (139) ; 140 ; 140 ; 144 ; 144 ; 146 ; 147 ;  
147 ; (147) ; 147 ; 147 ; 148 ; 148 ; 167 ; (168) ; (cf.6.  
141, 160; 12.55; 32.10); 169 ; 170 ; 178 ; 199 ;  
199 ; 200 ; 200 ; 235 ; 238 ; 241 ; 241 ; 241.

(Number of references in Book 2 : 49).

Book 3: (6-30) ; 17 ; (18) (cf. 7.96; 37.15) ; 20 ; 34 ; (46) ;  
(52) ; 57 ; (57) ; 65 ; 66 ; 67 ; (70) ; (70) ; 80 ; 80 ;  
(98) ; 101 ; 101 ; 103 ; 108 ; (110) ; (110) ; (113) ; 116 ;  
123 ; (125) ; 125 ; (129) ; (131) ; (136-37) ; (138) ; 138 ; (138) ;  
(Cf.33.78; 37.202). (Number of references in Book 3 : 34).

Book 4: 10 ; 39 ; 54 ; 66 ; 92 ; 98 ; (110-18). (Number of

references in Book 4 : 7).

Book 5 : 9-10 ; 24 ; 25 ; 36 ; 36-7 ; 58 ; 68. (Number of references in Book 5 : 7).

Book 6 : 10 ; 47 ; 51 ; 52 ; 120 ; 141 (cf. 2.168; 6.160; 12.55; 32.10); 160 ; 160-62 ; 181 ; 200 ; 201.  
(Number of references in Book 6 : 11).

Book 7 : 19 ; 20 ; 33 ; 33 ; 34 ; 34-5 ; 35 ; 36 ; 39 ; 40 ;  
44 ; 45-6 ; 47 ; 47 ; 47 ; 51 ; 53 ; 54 ; 54 ; 54 ;  
54 ; 55 ; 55 ; 55 ; 55 ; 55 ; 56 ; 57 ; 57 ; 57 ;  
58 ; 59 ; 60 ; 61 ; 61-2 ; 63 ; 68 ; 68 ; 69 ; 69 ;  
71 ; 74 ; 75 ; 75 ; 75 ; 75 ; 79 ; 80 ; 81 ; 81 ;  
82 ; 83 ; 83 ; 84 ; 85 ; 86 ; 86 ; 88 ; 88 ; 90 ;  
91 ; 92 ; 93 ; 94 ; 94 ; 95-6 ; 96 (cf. 3.18; 37.15) ;  
97-8 (cf. 12.20, 111; 33.151; 37.12f., 18); 99 ; 100 ;  
101 ; 101-03 ; 103-04 ; 104-06 ; 112 ; 112 ; 113 ;  
113 ; 114 ; 114 ; 115 (cf. 16.7) ; 116-17 ; 119 ; 120 ;  
120 ; 120 ; 121 ; 122 ; 122 ; 122 ; 125 ; 128 ;  
128 ; 133 ; 133 ; 134 ; 135 ; 136 ; 136 ; 137 ; 138 ;  
139 ; 139-40 ; 141 ; 142 ; 143-46 ; 147-48 ; 148 ;  
149 ; 149 ; 149 ; 150 ; 156 ; 156 ; 156 ; 157 ;  
157 ; 157 ; 158 ; 158 ; 158 ; 158 ; 158 ; 159 ; 159 ;

165 ; 166 ; 166 ; 172 ; 173 ; 173 ; 173 ; 176 ;  
176-77 ; 178-79 ; 180 ; 181 ; 181 ; 181 ; 181 ;  
181 ; 182 ; 182 ; 182 ; 182 ; 183-84 ; 186 ; 186 ;  
186 ; 187 ; 211 ; 211 ; 211 ; 212 ; 213 ; 214 ;  
214 ; 215. (Number of references in Book 7 : 158).

Book 8 : 4 ; 4-5 ; 11 ; 11 ; 15 ; 16 ; 16 ; 16-17 ; 18 ;  
19 ; 19 ; 20-1 ; 21 ; 22 ; 37 ; 47 ; 53 ; 53 ; 53 ;  
53 ; 55 ; 64 ; 64 ; 64 ; 64 ; 65 ; 69 ; 70 ; 71 ;  
96 ; 104 ; 104 ; 117 ; 131 ; 144 ; 144 ; 153 ; 155 ;  
155 ; 161 ; 161 ; 167 ; 170 ; 180 ; 182 ; 194 ; 194 ;  
195 ; 195 ; 195 ; 195 ; 196 ; 197 ; 209 ; 209 ;  
210 ; 210 ; 211 ; 213 ; 218 ; 221 ; 221 ; 222 ;  
223. (Number of references in Book 8 : 64).

Book 9 : 9 ; 11 ; 11 ; 25 ; 39 ; 55 ; 77 ; 116 ; 118 ; 119-  
21 ; 122 ; 123 ; 136 ; 137 ; 168 ; 170 ; 170 ;  
 171 ; 172 ; 172 ; 173. (Number of references in  
 Book 9 : 21).

Book 10: 5 ; 16 ; 20 ; 21 ; 36 ; 41 ; 45 ; 45 ; 50 ; 51 ;  
 51 ; 52 ; 52 ; 71 ; 71 ; 110 ; 110 ; 134 ; 139 ;  
 141 ; 141 ; 154. (Number of references in Book 10 :  
 22).

- Book 11 : 55 ; 114 ; 143 ; 143 ; 157 ; 174 ; 186 ; 186 ;  
 187 ; 189 ; 189 ; 190 ; 195 ; 197 ; 197 ; 213 ;  
244 ; 252. (Number of references in Book 11 : 18).
- Book 12 : 5 ; 13 ; 20 (cf. 7.97-8; 12.111; 33.151; 37.12f.,  
 18); 55 (cf. 2168; 6.141,160; 32.10); 111. (Num-  
 ber of references in Book 12 : 5).
- Book 13 : 24 ; 25 ; 84-7 ; 88 ; 92 ; 92 ; 92 ; 92. (Number  
 of references in Book 13 : 8).
- Book 14 : 12 ; 55 ; 60 ; 61 ; 66 ; 69 ; 72 ; 87 ; 88 ; 88 ;  
 88 ; 89 ; 89 ; 90 ; 91 ; 91 ; 92 ; 93 ; 93 ; 94 ;  
95 ; 96 ; 96 ; 97 ; 97 ; 97 ; 147 ; 148. (Number  
 of references in Book 14 : 28).
- Book 15 : 1 ; 2-3 ; 19 ; 47 ; 74 ; 74-5 ; 75 ; 76 ; 77 ;  
77 ; 78 ; 78 ; 83 ; 102 ; 119 ; 121 ; 125 ;  
 125 ; 126 ; 126 ; 134 ; 136-37. (Number of refer-  
 ences in Book 15 : 22).
- Book 16 : 7 (cf. 7.115) ; 8 ; 11 ; 11 ; 14 ; 14 ; 14 ; 15 ;  
36 ; 37 ; 75 ; 132 ; 132 ; 185 ; 192 ; 201 ; 216 ;  
234 ; 235 ; 236 ; 237 ; 237. (Number of references  
 in Book 16 : 22).

Book 17 : 1-6 ; 7 ; (7) ; 32 ; 81 ; 243 ; 243 ; 244 ; 244 ;  
244 ; (244). (Number of references in Book 17 : 11).

Book 18 : 6 ; 7 ; 7 ; 10 ; 11 ; 11 ; (12) (cf. 33.42-7, 132;  
 34.1) ; (12) ; 13 ; 13 ; 14 ; 14 ; (15) ; 15 ; 16 ;  
16 ; (17) ; 17 ; 18 ; 20 ; 20 ; 22-3 ; 27 ; 32 ;  
33 ; 35 ; (37) ; 41-3 ; 62 ; 72 ; 94 ; 107 ; 108 ;  
114 ; 139 ; 166 ; 182 ; 274 ; 285 ; (286) ; 307 .  
 (Number of references in Book 18 : 41).

Book 19 : 22 ; 23 ; 23 ; 23 ; 24 ; 24 ; (40) ; 50 ; (50) ; 87 ;  
92 ; 128 ; 137 ; 144 ; (156). (Number of references  
 in Book 19 : 15).

Book 20 : 144 ; 160. (Number of references in Book 20 : 2).

Book 21 : 6 ; 6 ; 7 ; 8 ; 8 ; 9 ; 10 ; (12). (Number of ref-  
 erences in Book 21 : 8).

Book 22 : 9 ; 9 ; (10) ; (11) ; (11) ; (12) ; 12 ; 13 ; (13) ; 114.  
 (Number of references in Book 22 : 10).

Book 23 : 58 ; 149. (Number of references in Book 23 : 2).

Book 24 : (Number of references in Book 24 : 0).

Book 25 : 5 ; 6 ; 6 ; 7 ; 20 ; 20 ; 24 ; 24 ; 52 ; 52.

(Number of references in Book 25 : 10).

Book 26 : 5 ; 7 ; 15 ; 19 ; 19 ; (19) ; 19 ; 138. (Number of references in Book 26 : 8).

Book 27 : 4. (Number of references in Book 27 : 1).

Book 28 : (12) (cf. 30.12) ; 14 ; 15 ; 16 ; 17-18 ; 18 ;  
18 ; 21 ; 30 ; 56 ; 62 ; (148) (cf. 33.20).  
(Number of references in Book 28 : 12).

Book 29 : 12-13 ; 16 ; 16 ; 72 ; 96 ; 96. (Number of references in Book 29 : 6).

Book 30 : (12) (cf. 28.12) ; 62-3. (Number of references in Book 30 : 2).

Book 31 : 6 ; 7 ; 7-8 ; 11 ; 11 ; (41) (cf. 36.121) ; 42 ;  
89 ; (89). (Number of references in Book 31 : 9).

Book 32 : 3 ; (10) ; 20 ; 123. (Number of references in Book 32 : 4).

Book 33 : 7 ; 9 ; 10 ; 11 ; 12 ; 12 ; (14-15) ; 15 ; (16) ;  
(17-18) ; 18 ; 19 ; 20 ; (20) (cf. 28.148) ; 21 ;  
21 ; 21 ; 29 ; (29-36) ; 38 ; (38) ; 38 ; 39 ; (42-7)



(cf. 18.12 ; 33.132; 34.1) ; 48 ; 48 ; 49 ; 50 ;  
 51 ; 53 ; 53 ; (55-6) ; 56 ; 56 ; 57 ; 57 ; 63 ;  
 (78) (cf. 3.138; 37.202) ; 78 ; 83 ; 83 ; 96-7 ;  
111 ; 112 ; (132) (cf. 18.12; 33.42-7; 34.1) ; 133 ;  
 134 ; (134) ; 134 ; (135) ; 136 ; (138) ; 138 ; 140 ;  
 (141) ; 142 ; 142 ; 143 ; 144 ; 145 ; 146 ; 147 ;  
147 ; 148 ; 148 ; 149 ; 149 ; 150 ; 150 ; (151)  
 (cf. 7.97-8; 12.20,111;37.12f.,18). (Number of  
 references in Book 33 : 70).

Book 34 : (1) (cf. 18.12; 33.42-7,132) ; 1 ; (3-4) ; 6 ; (6) ; (11-  
 12) ; 12 ; 13 ; 13 ; 13 ; 13 ; 14 ; 14 ; 15 ; 17 ;  
 18 ; 18 ; 19 ; 20 ; 20 ; 20 ; 21 ; 21 ; 21 ; 22 ;  
 (22) ; (23) ; 23 ; 24 ; (24) ; 25 ; 26 ; 26 ; 27 ; 28 ;  
 29 ; 29 ; 30 ; 30 ; 31 ; (31) ; (32) ; 32 ; (34) ; 36 ;  
 36 ; 36 ; 40 ; 43 ; 47 ; 48 ; (58) ; 64 ; 92 ; 93 ;  
137 ; (139) ; (139) ; 166. (Number of references in  
 Book 34 : 59).

Book 35 : (8) ; 10 ; 11 ; 12 ; 13 ; 14 ; 14 ; 16 ; 19 ; 19 ;  
20 ; 21 ; 22 ; 22 ; 22 ; 23 ; 23 ; 24 ; 24 ; 25 ;  
25 ; 26 ; 26 ; 27 ; 52 ; 66 ; 83 ; 91 ; 94 ; 100 ;  
108 ; 113 ; (115) ; 120 ; 121 ; 125 ; 127 ; 130 ;

131 ; 131 ; 135 ; 152 ; 154 ; 155-56 ; 157 ;  
 159 ; 160 ; 162 ; 164 ; 165 ; 173 ; 173 ; 197 ;  
 199-201. (Number of references in Book 35 : 54).

Book 36 : 5-6 ; 7 ; 22 ; 39 ; 40 ; 45 ; 46 ; 48 ; 49 ; 50 ;  
59 ; 60 ; 70 ; 91-3 ; 100 ; 102 ; 102 ; 102 ;  
 103 ; 103 ; (104) ; 106-08 ; 108 ; 109 ; 112 ; 112 ;  
113-15 ; 116-20 ; 116 ; (116) ; (121) (cf. 31.41) ;  
 (121) ; 176 ; 183 ; 185 ; 189 ; 204 ; 204. (Number  
 of references in Book 36 : 38).

Book 37 : 8 ; 9 ; 9 ; 9 ; 10 ; 10 ; 10 ; 11 ; 11 ; 11 ; 11 ;  
 12 ; 12 ; 12 ; (12-18) (cf. 7.97-8; 12.20,111; 33.  
 151) ; (15) (cf. 3.18;7.96) ; (16) ; 27 ; 42 ; (81) ;  
85 ; (202) (cf. 3.138;33.78). (Number of references  
 in Book 37 : 22).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Works of General Reference

Le Bonniec, H. "Bibliographie de l'Histoire naturelle de Pline l'Ancien," REL, 23(1945), 204-252. Complete from 1800, but deals only with the Historia Naturalis. Also contains list of previous bibliographies (p.205).

Hanslik, R. "Forschungsbericht "uber Plinius d.Ae.," AAHG, 8 (1955), 193-218.

----- "Plinius der Aeltere, II.Bericht," AAHG, 17 (1964), 65-80.

Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Bd. XXI. 1 (1951), s.v. "Plinius der Aeltere," cols.271-439 : <sup>sections</sup> ~~(articles)~~ by W. Aly, H. Gundel, R. Hanslik, W. Kroll, K.Ziegler.

C.Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII ex editione Gabrielis Brotier cum Notis et Interpretatione In Usum Delphini (London, 1826).

C.Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVII, edit. L.Jan and C.Mayhoff (Leipzig, Teubner, 1892-1909), 6 vols.

Pline L'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle, in Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé, texte établi, traduit et commenté, ed. J.Beaujeu, A.Ernout and others (Paris, 1947-1972), vols. 1-2, 8-17, 19-23, 26-32, 34, 37.

Pliny, Natural History, in Loeb Classical Library, edit. H.Rackham, W.H.S.Jones and D.E. Eichholz (London, Cambridge, Mass., 1947-1969), <sup>10</sup> vols.

B. Other Works

- Anderson, J.G.C., Cambridge Ancient History, (Cambridge, 1966), vol.X.
- Ashby, T., The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome, edit. I.A.Richmond (Oxford, 1935).
- Badian, E. in review of L.Pearson's The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, Gnomon, 33(1961), 660-67.
- ., "Caepio and Norbanus" in Studies in Greek and Roman History, (Oxford, 1964).
- ., Publicans and Sinners, (Ithaca, N.Y., 1972).
- Basanoff, V., "Tradition mythologique des annales, 5 : M. Calpurnius Flamma," Latomus, 10(1951), 281-84.
- Beloch, K.J., Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt, (Leipzig, 1886).
- ., Griechische Geschichte<sup>2</sup>, (Berlin/Leipzig, 1922), vol.III, (Berlin, 1925-7), vol.IV.
- ., Römische Geschichte, (Berlin, 1926).
- Berve, H., Das Alexanderreich, (Munich, 1926).
- Birt, T., "Eine Siegesinschrift und geographische Karte des Tuditanus," Rhein.Mus., 73(1920), 309.
- Boehm. RE Bd.7(1912) s.v. "Gallus et Galla, Graecus et Graeca."
- Boissier, G., Étude sur la vie et les ouvrages de M.T.Varron, (Paris, 1861).
- Bonvicini, P., "Il Piceno descritto da Plinio il Vecchio," RAL serie VIII, 6(1951), 16-30.
- Broughton, T.R.S., Magistrates of the Roman Republic, (New York, Am.Phil.Assoc., 1951), vol.I, (Cleveland, 1968), vol.II.

- Bruns, C., Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui<sup>7</sup>, (Tübingen, 1909).
- Brunt, P., in review of L. Pearson's The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, History, 46(1961), 116-17.
- ., "The Equites in the Late Republic," Second International Conference of Economic History, Aix-en-Provence, 1962, vol. I, Trade and Politics in the Ancient World, 117-49.
- ., Italian Manpower, 225B.C.-A.D.14 (Oxford, 1971).
- Bulst, C.M., "Cinnanum Tempus," Historia, 13 (1964), 307-37.
- Burns, M.A.T., An Historical Commentary on the Reign of Augustus based on the Evidence of Pliny the Elder Naturalis Historia, unpublished Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1960.
- Calabi, I., "I Commentarii di Silla come fonte storica," Mem.Acc.Naz.Lincei, VIII, 3(1950/51), 278-79.
- Camporeale, G., "Melpo e Melfi," SE, 29(1961), 219-31.
- Caprino, C., et al., La Colonna di Marco Aurelio, (Rome, 1955).
- Cavaignac, E., "L'erreur de Pline XXXIII, 13, [44]," Congrès International de Numismatique de Paris, II: Actes (1953), 573-76.
- Ciaceri, E., "Claudio e Nerone nelle Storie di Plinio," in Processi politici e Relazioni internazionali, (Rome, 1918), pp.387-434.
- Cichorius, C., Römische Studien, (Berlin, 1922).
- ., "Zu römischen Malern," Rhein.Mus., 76 (1927), 325-26.
- Clerici, L., "Un antica leggenda (Helico e l'invasione dell'Italia)," Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte, 27 (1947), 250-54.

- Coarelli, F., "Classe dirigente romana e arti figurative," Dialoghi di Archeologia, 4-5 (1970-71), 256f.
- ., et al. (edd.), Roma-Medio Republican (Rome, SPQR: 1973).
- Corbett, J.H., "L. Metellus (Cos. 251, 247), Agrarian Commissioner?", CR, n.s. 20(1970), 7-8.
- Corcoran, T.H., Seneca, Naturales Quaestiones, (London, Cambridge, Mass., 1971), vols. I-II.
- Crawford, M.H., "The Edict of M. Marius Gratidianus," PCPhS, n.s. 14(1968), 1-4.
- ., Roman Republican Coin Hoards, Royal Numismatic Society, Special Publication no. 4 (London, 1969).
- Delatte, A., "Les doctrines pythagoriciennes des Livres de Numa," Bull. de l'Acad. roy. de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, V série, 22(1936), 19-40.
- Detlefsen, D., "Ueber des älteren Plinius geschichte seiner zeit und ihr verhältnis zum Tacitus," Philologus, 34(1876), 40-49.
- ., "Das Pomerium Roms und die Grenzen Italiens," Hermes, 21(1886), 497-562.
- ., Untersuchungen über die Zusammensetzung der Naturgeschichte des Plinius, (Berlin, 1899).
- Dill, S., Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, (London, 1904).
- Drumann, W., and Groebe, P., Geschichte Roms<sup>2</sup>, (Leipzig, 1908), vol. IV.
- Duff, A.M., Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire, (Oxford, 1928).
- Earl, D.C., The Political Thought of Sallust, (Cambridge, 1961).

- Ehrenberg, V. and Jones, A.H.M., Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius<sup>2</sup>, (Oxford, 1963).
- Fabia, P., Les Sources de Tacite dans les Histoires et les Annales, (Paris, 1893).
- Ferguson, J., The Religions of the Roman Empire, (London, 1970).
- Ferrero, E., L'Arc d'Auguste à Suse, (Turin, 1901).
- Ferri, S., Plinio il Vecchio, Storia delle arti antiche, (Rome, 1946).
- Formigé, C.-J., "Le Trophée de la Turbie," Compt. rend. de l'acad. des inscr., 38 (1910), 76-87, 509-16.
- Formigé, J., "L'inscription du trophée des Alpes à la Turbie," Bulletin de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France, (1943-44), 360-67.
- Frank, T., An Economic History of Rome, (Baltimore, 1927).
- ., An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, (Baltimore, 1933), vol. I.
- Fredericksen, M.W., "The Contribution of Archaeology to the Agrarian Problem in the Gracchan Period," Dialoghi di Archeologia, 4-5 (1970-71), 351, 355f.
- Fuchs, H., Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom, (Berlin, 1938).
- Gagé, J., "Arruns de Clusium et l'appel aux Gaulois(?). À propos d'une tradition haruspicinale sur la vigne et l'olivier," Revue de l'histoire des Religions, 143 (1953), 170-208.
- Gahais, A., RE Bd.3 (1899) s.v. "Claudius," no.230.
- Gardthausen, V., Augustus und Seine Zeit, (Leipzig, 1891), vol. I.
- Gelzer, M., "Die Unterdrückung der Bacchanalien bei Livius," Hermes, 71 (1936), 283-84.

- Gercke, A., Seneca-Studien, (Leipzig, 1895).
- Giordano, C., in Rend. Accad. di Arch. di Napoli, n.s. 45 (1970), 219.
- Gisinger, F., RE Supplbd. IV (1924) s.v. "Geographie (Plinius)," cols. 675-76.
- Grant, M., From Imperium to Auctoritas, (Cambridge, 1946).
- Grenade, P., "Le mythe de Pompée et les Pompéiens sous les Césars," Revue des Études Anciennes, 52 (1950), 28-63.
- Grimal, P., "Encyclopédies antiques," CHM, 9(1965-66), 459-82.
- Grohmann, A., RE Bd. 14 (1930) s.v. "Marsyaba."
- Grueber, H.A., Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum, (London, 1910), vol. I.
- Gundel, H., RE Bd. 8 (1913) s.v. "Ventidius."
- Hanslik, R., RE Bd. IXA.1 (1961) s.v. "M. Vipsanius Agrippa," no. 2.
- ., RE Bd. XXIII.1 (1957) s.v. "Proculcius," no. 2.
- Harris, W.V., Rome in Etruria and Umbria, (Oxford, 1971).
- Haug, I., "Der römische Bundesgenossenkrieg 91-88 v. Chr. bei Titus Livius," WJA, 2(1947), 100-139.
- Heinze, R., Die augusteische Kultur<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig, 1933).
- Heller, J.L., "Some Points of Natural History in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis," in Homenaje a Antonio Tovar (Madrid, 1972).
- Henderson, M.I., "Julius Caesar and Latium in Spain," JRS 32 (1942), 1-13.
- ., "The Establishment of the Equester Ordo," JRS, 53 (1963), 61-72.



- Herkert, C.H., Historical Commentary Drawn from the Natural History of Pliny the Elder for the Years 54-76 AD, unpublished Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1956.
- Hermann, L., "Ennius et les Livres de Numa," Latomus, 5 (1946), 87-90.
- Hill, G.F., Historical Roman Coins, (London, 1909).
- Hirschfeld, O., "Timagenes und die gallische Wandersage," Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, (1894), 345-47.
- Hofmann, M., RE XVIII.2 (1942) s.v. "Pacuvius," nos. 7, 12.
- Hubaux, J., and Leroy, M., "Le Mythe du phénix," Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fasc. 82 (1939), 216-21.
- Jacoby, F., Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, pt. 2A, (Berlin, 1926).
- ., ibid., pt. 2B, comm., (Leiden, 1962).
- Jex-Blake, K., and Sellers, E., The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art, (London, 1896).
- Jones, A.H.M., "The Elections under Augustus," JRS, 45 (1955), 9-21.
- ., The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces<sup>2</sup>, (Oxford, 1971).
- ., The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate, (Oxford, 1972).
- Jones, H.S., Cambridge Ancient History, (Cambridge, 1964), vol. X.
- Kaerst, J., Geschichte des Hellenismus, (Leipzig, 1927), vol. I.
- Klebs, E., RE Bd.2 (1896) s.v. "Aufidius," no. 5.
- Klotz, A., "Die Arbeitsweise des älteren Plinius und die Indices Auctorum," Hermes, 42 (1907), 323-29.

- Koestermann, E., Cornelius Tacitus-Annalen, (Heidelberg, 1963), vol. I.
- Kornemann, E., "Die letzten Ziele der Politik Alexanders des Grossen," Klio, 16 (1920), 214.
- ., RE Bd. XVIII.1 (1939) s.v. "oppidum", cols. 708f.
- Labhardt, A., "Quelques témoignages d'auteurs latins sur la personnalité et l'oeuvre de Pline l'Ancien," Mélanges offerts à M. Max Niedermann, (Neuchâtel, 1944), 105-114.
- La Regina, A., "Le Iscrizioni Osche di Pietrabbondante e la Questione di Bovianum Vetus," Rhein. Mus., 109 (1966), 260-68.
- ., "Cluviae e il territorio Carecino," RAL, 22 (1967), 87f.
- Lasaulx, E. von, "Über die Bücher des Königs Numā," Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-Philolog. Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5 (1847-1849), 83-130.
- Latte, K., Römische Religionsgeschichte, (Munich, 1960).
- Leeman, A. D., Orationis Ratio, (Amsterdam, 1963), 2 vols.
- Letta, C., I Marsi e il Fucino nell'Antichità (Milan, 1973).
- Lintott, A. W., Violence in Republican Rome, (Oxford, 1968).
- Luterbacher, F., Der Prodigien Glaube und Prodigienstil der Römer, (Burgdorf, 1904).
- Mattingly, H., Roman Coins, (London, 1967).
- Meise, E., Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Julisch-Claudischen Dynastie, (Munich, 1969).
- Michels, A. K., The Calendar of the Roman Republic, (Princeton, 1967).

- Mommsen, T., "Über den Verfall des römischen Münzwesens in der Kaiserzeit," Berichte über die Verhandlungen der k.sächs.Ges.der Wissenschaft zu Leipzig, 3(1851), 180-312.
- ., Geschichte des römischen Münzwesens, (Berlin, 1860).
- ., Römische Forschungen, (Berlin, 1864), vols.I-II.
- ., Römisches Staatsrecht, (Leipzig, 1876), vols.I-II.
- ., History of Rome, trans. by W.P.Dickson (New York, 1887), vol.I.
- Momigliano, A., "Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone," RAL, Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche, Ser.VI, 7-8 (1931-32), 293-336.
- Mongez, A., "Sur l'Emploi du Fer dans la Fabrication des Monnaies antiques," Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions, 9(1831), 252-265.
- Morgan, M.G., "'Metellus Pontifex' and Ops Opifera: A Note on Pliny Naturalis Historia 11.174," Phoenix, 27 (1973), 35-41.
- Müller, K.O., Die Etrusker<sup>22</sup>, (Stuttgart, 1877).
- Münzer, F., "Zur Kunstgeschichte des Plinius," Hermes, 30 (1895), 499-547.
- ., "Die Zeitrechnung des Annalisten Piso," Hermes, 31 (1896), 308-12.
- ., Beiträge zur Quellenkritik der Naturgeschichte des Plinius, (Berlin, 1897).
- ., "Die Quelle des Tacitus für die Germanenkriege," Bonner Jahrbücher, 104 (1899), 67-111.
- ., RE Bd.3(1899) s.v. "Caelius" no.35; "Calpurnius"

- no.42; "Claudius" no.304; Bd.4 (1901) s.v. "Cornelius" no.350; Bd.5(1905) s.v. "Domitius" no.42; Bd.6(1909) s.v. "Fabius" no.110; "Fabius" no.116; "Fidustius"no. 1; Bd.7(1912) s.v. "L.Fulvius Curvus"; Bd.8(1913) s.v. "Hostilius" no.4; Bd.14(1930) s.v. "Marcius"no.17; "Marius" no.42; Bd.XXI.1(1951) s.v. "Plautius" no.21, no.24; Zweite Reihe 2 (1923) s.v. "M.Sergius Silus" no. 42.
- ., Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien, (Stuttgart, 1920).
- Nenci, G., "Le Cottianae civitates in Plinio HN III, 20. [135], " PP, 6(1951), 213-15.
- ., "Considerazioni sulla Storia della Monetazione Romana in Plinio (Nat.Hist., XXXIII 42-47), "Athenaeum, n.s. 46(1968), 3-36.
- Nicolet, C., L'Ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine, (Paris, 1966), vol.I.
- Niebuhr, B.G., The History of Rome, trans.by J.C.Hare and C.Thirlwall(London, 1837), vol.I<sup>3</sup>, trans. by W.Smith and L.Schmitz (London, 1842), vol.III.
- Nissen, H., "Die Historien des Plinius, " Rhein.Mus., N.F. 26(1871), 497-548.
- ., Italische Landeskunde, (Berlin, 1883), vol.I.
- Nock, A.D., "Posidonius," JRS, 49(1959), 14-15.
- Ogilvie, R.M., A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5 (Oxford, 1965).
- "  
Onnerfors, A., review of Budé edition of Books 21, 22 of Pliny's Historia Naturalis edit. J.André, Gnomon, 44 (1972), 138.
- Pais, E., Storia della Sicilia, (Turin/Palermo, 1894), vol.I.
- ., Storia Critica di Roma, (Rome, 1920), vol.IV.

- Pappano, A., "Agrippa Postumus," CP, 36(1941), 41f.
- Parker, H.M.D., The Roman Legions, (Cambridge, 1958).
- Pearson, L., The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great, (New York, Am.Phil.Assoc., 1960).
- , "Pliny, Nat. Hist. III 57" Mnemosyne, 15(1962), 46-7.
- Peter, H., Wahrheit und Kunst, Geschichtschreibung und Plagiat im klassischen Altertum, (Leipzig, 1911).
- Philipp, H., RE Bd.14(1930) s.v. "Manduria" and "Mardonia";  
Zweite Reihe VIIA.1(1939) s.v. "Tropaea Augusti".
- Picard, G.C., Les Trophées Romains, (Paris, 1957).
- Platner, S., and Ashby, T., A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome, (London, 1929).
- Premerstein, A. von, "Ein Elogium des C.Sempronius Tuditanus,"  
Jahreshefte des österr.arch.Inst., 10(1907), 271.
- Reinach, A., in: Daremberg et Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines, (Paris, 1904), vol.IV,  
s.v. "Signa militaria".
- Reinhold, M., Marcus Agrippa, a biography, (Geneva, N.Y. 1933).
- Reisch, E., "Die Statuenbasis des C.Sempronius Tuditanus,"  
Jahreshefte des österr.arch.Inst., 11(1908), 283.
- Rhen, J.E., A Historical Commentary on the Reign of Tiberius Based on the Evidence of the Historia Naturalis of Pliny the Elder, unpublished Thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1967.
- Ross, L., Archäologische Aufsätze, (Leipzig, 1861), vol.II.
- Sallmann, K.G., Die Geographie des älteren Plinius in ihrem Verhältnis zu Varro, (Berlin, 1971).
- Salmon, E.T., Samnium and the Samnites, (Cambridge, 1967).

- Salmon, E.T., Roman Colonization under the Republic, (London, 1969).
- Sanctis, G. de, Storia dei Romani, (Turin, 1907), vol.II.
- Scardigli, B., "A proposito di due passi su Sertorio," Atene e Roma, 15(1970), 174-76.
- Schaefer, A., "Miscellen zur römischen Geschichte," Commentationes Philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommseni, (Berlin, 1877).
- Schanz, M., Geschichte d.römischen Literatur (I.von Müller's Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt.VIII), Teil II, ed.4(Munich, 1935), by C.Hosius.
- Schneider, A., Le Premier Livre "Ad Nationes" de Tertullien, (Rome, 1968).
- Schulz, F., History of Roman Legal Science, (Oxford, 1967).
- Schwegler, A., Römische Geschichte, (Tübingen, 1867), vol.I, (Tübingen, 1872), vol.III.
- Schwenn, F., RE Bd.15(1932), s.v."Menschenopfer".
- Scullard, H.H., Roman Politics, 220-150BC, (Oxford, 1951).
- ., From the Gracchi to Nero<sup>2</sup>, (New York, 1963).
- Sherwin-White, A.N., The Roman Citizenship, (Oxford, 1939).
- ., Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome (Cambridge, 1967).
- Soltau, W., "Die Inschrift des Flavius," Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 2(1885), 1275-80.
- Sordi, M., "Sulla cronologia liviana del IV secolo," Helikon, 5(1965), 3-44.
- Speranza, G., Il Piceno dalle origini alla fine d'ogni sua autonomia sotto Augusto, (Ascoli, 1900), vol.I.
- Stein, A., Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur, (Prague, 1931).

- Steiner, G., "The scepticism of the elder Pliny," CW, 48(1955), 137-43.
- Sumner, G.V., "The Lex Annalis under Caesar," Phoenix, 25 (1971), 247-48.
- Sutherland, C.H.V., Oxford Classical Dictionary<sup>2</sup>, (Oxford, 1970), s.v. "Coinage, Roman".
- Sydenham, E.A., The Coinage of the Roman Republic, (London, 1952).
- Syme, R., Tacitus, (Oxford, 1958), 2 vols.
- ., The Roman Revolution<sup>2</sup>, (Oxford, 1962).
- Tarn, W.W., Alexander the Great, (Cambridge, 1948), vol.II.
- Taylor, L.R., The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, (Middletown, Am.Phil.Assoc., 1931).
- Thomsen, R., The Italic Regions, (Copenhagen, 1947).
- ., Early Roman Coinage, (Copenhagen, 1957), 3 vols.
- Townend, G.B., "The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius," Hermes, 88 (1960), 98-120.
- ., "Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny" Hermes, 89(1961), 227-48.
- ., review of C.Questa's Studi sulle fonti degli Annales di Tacito (Rome, 1960) in JRS, 52(1962), 281-82.
- ., "Some Rhetorical Battle-Pictures in Dio", Hermes, 92(1964), 467-81.
- ., "Cluvius Rufus in the Histories of Tacitus," AJPh, 85(1964), 337-77.
- Toynbee, A., Hannibal's Legacy, (Oxford, 1965), vol.I.
- Treggiari, S., Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic, (Oxford, 1969).

Urlichs, L., Chrestomathia Pliniana, (Berlin, 1857).

Vorhauser, O., "Die religiös-sittliche Weltanschauung des  
"älteren Plinius," Programm des kaiserl.königl.Staats-  
Gymnasium zu Innsbruck, (1860), pp.3-32.

Walbank, F.W., "The Geography of Polybius," Classica et  
Mediaevalia, 9(1948), 160.

-----., A Historical Commentary on Polybius, (Oxford,  
1957), vol.I, (Oxford, 1967), vol.II.

Warmington, E.H., "Plinius der Ältere," (ins Deutsche  
übertragen von Dr.K.Fassmann) in Die Grossen der Welt-  
geschichte, (Zurich, 1972), vol.II, pp.310-331.

Watson, G.R., The Roman Soldier, (Ithaca, N.Y., 1969).

Weinstock, S., "Libri Fulgurales," PBSR, 19(1951), 143.

-----., Divus Julius, (Oxford, 1971).

Wellesley, K., "The fable of a Roman attack on Aden," PP, 39  
(1954), 401-05.

Wilkes, J., "Julio-Claudian Historians," CW, 65(1972), 177-  
203.

Wölfflin, E., "Die Rettung Scipios am Tessin," Hermes, 23  
(1888), 307-10, 479-80.

Wuilleumier, P., Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine,  
(Paris, 1939), vol.I.